TO MY FATHER

I Dedicate this Book

IN GRATEFUL AND REVERENT AFFECTION

AN OUTLINE

OF

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

BY

DAVID FOSTER ESTES, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION IN COLGATE UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, NEW YORK

PHILADELPHIA

THE JUDSON PRESS

BOSTON CHICAGO ST. LOUIS NEW YORK

LOS ANGELES KANSAS CITY SEATTLE TORONTO

New Edition, 1919

CONTENTS

PREFACE

THIS Outline of New Testament Theology was originally prepared for the use of classes in the Hamilton Theological Seminary, and has been repeatedly used in the course of classroom work. It is now offered with diffidence to a wider circle, in the hope that it so summarizes the teachings of the New Testament as to be of some service to students of the Word of God.

It will at once be noted that it claims to be only an outline. Consequently conclusions are often given without a statement of the reasons which have led to their acceptance, and all exegetical discussions have been rigidly excluded. This has been required by the condensation indispensable for classroom work, and no less by the author's conception of the scope of the science. It may well be, however, that a simple statement of conclusions will

be found helpful to many, and where reasons for or against a conclusion may be desired, they will seldom be far to seek.

This Outline is also peculiar in the constant comparison of the results attained on each topic. While by this method the special thoughts of each New Testament writer stand out less distinctly as a whole, there has been found in use a practical gain for students, which others may also share. If it should be desirable to consider by itself the teaching of any author or group of books of the New Testament, this can readily be done by the use of the index.

The author desires to make, once for all, a frank acknowledgment of indebtedness to sources too numerous and varied to mention. Treatises on New Testament Theology, commentaries, histories, theological discussions standard and fugitive, all have contributed by agreement and by disagreement to mold and fix the conclusions which find expression here.

DAVID FOSTER ESTES.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

AN OUTLINE

OF

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

It is the peculiar task of Biblical Theology to state, arrange and compare the theological doctrines and conceptions which are to be found in the Scriptures. Naturally this science falls into two principal divisions, the Theology of the Old Testament and of the New Testament, each of which at once presupposes and helps the other, while each may and should be treated separately. It is further possible, and is often in many ways helpful, to formulate by itself the theology of a single author, either of the Old Testament or of the New. It is intended in this outline rapidly to cover the whole field of

the Theology of the New Testament, and to set forth in their relations the views and teachings of Jesus and his apostles concerning the facts and truths involved in the relations of God and man.

The name Biblical Theology was at one time employed to designate such a system of Dogmatics as was based upon the Scriptures rather than upon either creeds or reason, while in substance and form it was still systematic and dogmatic. The name in its modern sense was first used by Gabler in 1787, and in Germany the science from that time forward gradually developed. The first American work published on any part of Biblical Theology was Thompson's "Theology of Christ," 1870, and the first lectures in this department in any American theological school are said to have been given in 1883.[1] Since that time it has received steadily increasing attention, though not yet all that its importance demands.

[1] See "Biblical Theology: its History and its Mission," by Professor George H. Gilbert, in the "Biblical World," July and December, 1895.

Biblical Theology must be classified as a historical science. So far as the conceptions which it sets forth are concerned, its aim is neither apologetical nor polemical, but simply descriptive. It neither attacks nor defends them, but merely states them. In order to be fair this statement must necessarily be sympathetic and appreciative. Also, it must be made as far as possible from the point of view, not of the modern student, but of the ancient teacher. In this study all prepossessions, theological, metaphysical or ethical, must be laid aside. All notions as to how the authors must or should have felt, spoken or taught, must be put one side, while the answer is patiently and candidly sought to the question, "As a matter of fact how did Jesus and his apostles feel, speak and teach?" Not even the importance of New Testament doctrine, from its influence on the past or from the value which we ourselves may set upon it, will in any way justify a different method of procedure; rather does its importance and value require this very method, in order that our

comprehension and use of it may not be hindered or nullified by the importation of modern notions or personal prejudices. Further, no theory of inspiration and no assertion or denial of revelation is needed or helpful in this science, for its aim is simply an accurate statement of facts as to opinions and teachings of which the character, and consequently the statement, must and will remain the same, if correct, whatever explanation of their origin is accepted and asserted.

New Testament Theology is closely related, not only to Old Testament Theology, but also to other departments of theological science. On the one hand, it presupposes and to a greater or less extent builds upon History, Isagogics and Exegesis, and on the other, it contributes in its turn to other sciences, especially to History and Systematic Theology. Not only is a knowledge of the contents of the Old Testament an indispensable preliminary to New Testament Theology, but an accurate comprehension of the conditions, spirit and

views which prevailed in the first century among both Jews and Gentiles, is no less important. To investigate the authorship, preservation or condition of the documents with which it deals, is no part of the peculiar task of New Testament Theology; its task is rather to build upon the assured results of criticism, alike textual, historical and literary; since, should it discuss the character, origin and authority of its sources, it would just so far trespass on the domain either of Isagogics or of Systematic Theology. In the same way, while, without the materials which are furnished by Exegesis, Biblical Theology would be impossible, yet it properly uses only the results of Exegesis, ignoring its processes, presupposing both the principles of interpretation and their proper application in detail. In turn New Testament Theology makes most valuable contributions to both History and Dogmatics. It may be called not unfitly the first volume of the history of Christian dogma, a volume without which no other can well be written, and to

Systematic Theology it furnishes the most important as well as the largest part of its materials.

The task of Biblical Theology, to set forth in scientific form the doctrinal views and teachings contained in the Scriptures, is not easy. All words necessarily, even in the Bible, to some extent conceal the very ideas which they reveal ; and most of all is this true in theology, where upon words drawn from the visible, the earthly, the temporal, the human, is laid the duty of declaring the invisible, the heavenly, the eternal, the divine. To the difficulties which every thinker on religious topics finds in expression, are added the difficulties which meet the student whenever he attempts to comprehend teachings, the form of which was adapted to men of other ages, tongues and conditions. To these difficulties of original expression and present comprehension must be added the further difficulties of restatement, for it can never be easy to transfer a thought, least of all a religious thought, itself ancient and wrapped

in ancient forms of statement, into modern forms which shall be at once accurate and adequate. It is also to be remembered that no Biblical author ever attempted anything like a scientific or systematic discussion of theology. With few exceptions the theological thought found its Scriptural expression not at all for its own sake, but wholly for the sake of practical lessons which it was desired to impress, — the statement of doctrine existing only for the development or correction of the spiritual life of the individual or the church. Consequently the Biblical statements are, as they stand, only partial and incomplete, and the emphasis laid on certain truths or aspects of truth may be not absolute but relative. It results, then, that the argument from the silence of any book or author must be employed with great caution; that only with much painstaking can the incomplete teachings be fitted into such a system of doctrine as may be credibly attributed to the various authors; and that conjecture must of necessity sometimes be employed to supplement and

round out these fragmentary teachings, though such indispensable divination must be frankly acknowledged to be uncertain, even when plausible.

For the purposes of this work all the canonical books of the New Testament will be accepted as authentic documents. While justification [1] of this course cannot here be given, as it belongs in the sphere of introduction, the course may be all the more readily and safely adopted, inasmuch as all the books which are distrusted by any criticism which at present needs to be reckoned with, are of such a character that in any case they must receive distinct treatment, and the conclusions drawn from them are thus readily recognized and, if necessary, easily eliminated. Even if the fourth Gospel is confidently ascribed to the apostle John himself, it must yet be treated separately from the syn-

[1] Compare the discussion by Professor G. B. Stevens, D.D., ("Theology of the New Testament," p. 256), of the work of the Biblical theologian. "He can only follow what seems to him the probabilities and adopt a working hypothesis. He can, at least, expound the contents of the books themselves."

optic Gospels. The Apocalypse constitutes a class by itself. Both the prison and the pastoral epistles, if genuine, constitute distinct stages of Pauline thought. Jude and II. Peter contribute to the Theology of the New Testament so little that is peculiar to themselves, that the question of their authenticity or genuineness becomes in this relation quite unimportant.

There is general agreement as to the grouping of the New Testament books according to the various types of thought which they exemplify. The teaching of Jesus first demands attention, not necessarily as a standard for the rest or as being of superior authoritativeness, but as, at any rate, prior in time to the other teachings and presupposed by them. His teaching is presented in two distinct phases, one found in the synoptic Gospels, the other in the fourth Gospel, and these two phases must receive correspondingly distinct treatment. A second group of documents, which relate more or less closely to what may be called Judaic Christianity, is made up of the book of Acts,

which gives the earliest developments among the original apostles from the doctrines and work of Jesus, the letter of James, Jude's brief exhortation, the two letters bearing the name of Peter, which may present a type of thought somewhat developed beyond the most primitive conceptions of the original believers, and the traces of apostolic or other early Christian thought which are to be traced in the first three Gospels. The teaching of Paul, of course, demands distinct treatment on account of both its amount and its historical importance. Aside from what is preserved in Acts, four chief stages of his teaching are discernible in the four groups of letters attributed to him, which differ more or less from each other in style, themes and views as well as in date. Regardless of authorship the epistle to the Hebrews is a natural pendant to the teachings of Paul. In the fourth group of documents is found the teaching of John, this group consisting of the fourth Gospel, his epistles and the Apocalypse.

The usual practice is to develop in its turn

each of these types of thought completely. This method has the advantage of bringing out with great distinctness the peculiarities in the teaching of each author. But unfortunately this distinctness becomes too often separation, and not seldom exaggeration.[1] Also the great amount of material renders it at best a difficult matter to make satisfactory comparisons. By some writers comparison between views has been so little attempted that the title of such works instead of New Testament Theology, might better be Types of Theological Thought embraced in the New Testament. Unity of treatment is not only presupposed in the very name of the science, but is demanded also, so far as may be practicable, by the historic and demonstrable unity of the New Testament itself. It would seem that the unity thus imperatively demanded could best be secured by a constant comparison of the results attained in the several

[1] Compare Professor W. Wrede, "Ueber Aufgabe und Methode der sogenannten neutestamentlichen Theologie," 1897, pp. 17–34.

groups of books and a continual unifying of these results, so far as their harmony permits, or a corresponding display of their diversity, when it appears. Such, then, is the course which will be followed in this outline.

CHAPTER II

HISTORIC FACTS RELATING TO JESUS

As a historical religion Christianity rests primarily upon the facts of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. From the nature of the case very little autobiographical matter has been preserved to us. The synoptic Gospels record from the lips of Jesus himself an indirect claim of Davidic descent (Matt. xxii. 41–45), his recognition of John as his forerunner (Matt. xi. 7–19; xxi. 24–27), his confession of his poverty while engaged in his work as a teacher (Matt. viii. 20), his repeated claims to work miracles (Matt. ix. 6; xi. 4, 5, 21, 23; xii. 28; xvi. 9, 10; Lk. iv. 23–26), his frequent prophecies of his death and resurrection (Matt. ix. 15; xvi. 21; xx. 28; xxvi. 12, 26–28), to which were added special forecasts of the scattering of his disciples from him (Matt. xxvi. 31),

of the betrayal by one of them (Matt. xxvi. 21–25), of his being delivered over to the Gentiles and crucified (Matt. xx. 19), and of his resurrection (Matt. xvii. 22, 23), while presumably it was from himself that the narrative of the temptation (Matt. iv. 1–11; Lk. iv. 1–13) originally came.

Some of the same facts are mentioned in the still fewer autobiographical statements preserved by John. We find in the fourth Gospel the claim to miracle working (x. 38), the choice of the disciples (vi. 70; xiii. 18), prophecy of betrayal by one of them (xiii. 21–27), and the foretelling that he should die and that the death would be by crucifixion (iii. 14; x. 11–18; xii. 7, 32).

The synoptic Gospels are not complete biographies but only fragmentary records of the life of Jesus. Thirty years are scarcely touched upon, and the other three years are described very incompletely. The facts of the miraculous conception, the virgin-birth, the relation of Jesus to the household of Joseph, and the remote descent from David are given

with substantial agreement by both Matthew and Luke. The latter assigns a reason for the fact that it was at Bethlehem that he was born, and the former, asserting the same fact, adds the narratives of the Magi and the flight into Egypt followed by the residence at Nazareth, which last fact is given by all the Synoptists. The three Gospels alike relate the baptism, the temptation, and the Galilean ministry, to which Luke alone adds an account of the Perean work. All agree in the length of the ministry as a whole, in the intensity and personal self-sacrifice with which it was carried on, and in its effects, — wide popularity rapidly won but followed by estrangement, first of the religious leaders, later, of the people in general, culminating in national rejection. The character of the ministry is harmoniously presented, all the reports including two chief elements: supremely authoritative teaching and its reënforcement by miraculous deeds of many sorts. In each of these Gospels may be traced two stages of the ministry, an appeal to the nation as a whole, and,

after the failure of this appeal and consequent upon it, the development of the kingdom on the basis of individual appeal and individual acceptance. All three agree almost verbally in the story of the passion, burial and resurrection.

John, beginning his Gospel with the testimony of the Baptist at the time of the baptism of Jesus which he implies, deals with different portions of the ministry from those chosen by the Synoptists, but presents a ministry of the same character, distinguished by authority of teaching supported by miraculous attestation. While Galilean and Perean work is not excluded, the ministry reported is chiefly Judean. Of popularity there is less mention than in the other Gospels; of estrangement more. The Johannine story of the passion and resurrection is in harmony with the synoptic narrative, but in statement varies much from it and adds much to it. On the whole it may be said that while the first three Gospels justify the claim that Jesus was the Christ, the fourth demonstrates his character and nature.

The early chapters of Acts, independently of the date at which the narratives were committed to writing or arranged in their present form, bear manifest and sufficient marks of being the testimony of eye-witnesses. Their tone is the tone of the original church at Jerusalem in its primitive period. In the first five chapters of Acts with their clear stamp of early date, is to be found confirmation of the Gospel narratives of the betrayal by Judas (i. 16), of Pilate's desire to release Jesus (iii. 13), of the part played by Herod (iv. 27) and of the crucifixion and death of Jesus (ii. 23; iii. 15; iv. 10; v. 30). It is also declared that Jesus was accredited by the possession and manifestation of miraculous powers (ii. 22); the resurrection and the relation of the apostles to the risen one are emphasized (ii. 24, 32; iii. 15; iv. 10; v. 30); and in addition the ascension is taught (i. 22; ii. 33; iii. 21; v. 31).

James and Jude are silent as to the details of Christ's ministry, of which, it may be remembered, his brothers were not witnesses. In

I. Peter there is no unmistakable reference to the early life and ministry of Jesus, though "gird yourselves with humility" (v. 5) may not unfitly be regarded as a reminiscence of the scene when he girded himself to wash the feet of his disciples. In relation to his passion, his silent patience is commended as an example to all (ii. 23); the scourging is vividly suggested by the peculiar word "wale" (ii. 24); and the simple expressions "blood" (i. 2) and "put to death" (iii. 18) are supplemented by the more definite "wood" or "tree" (ii. 24). Even if "gone into heaven" (iii. 22), which implies the ascension, were not interpreted as necessarily implying resurrection as well, that fact is by no means ignored, for it is regarded as the real basis of Christian hope (i. 3). In II. Peter there is especially clear reference to the transfiguration and to the morning scene by the lake (i. 14, 16–18).

The speeches of Paul recorded in the Acts substantially agree with the speeches of Peter. He declares that the baptism and testimony of

John preceded the work of Jesus (xiii. 24; xix. 4); that Jesus himself was descended from David (xiii. 23); that at the demand of the people he, though innocent, was condemned by Pilate, was crucified and buried, and that his resurrection was confirmed by many witnesses (xiii. 26–31). In his first letter to the Thessalonians Paul speaks of the death of Jesus from the hostility of the Jews, and includes his resurrection as being, equally with his death, accepted and important as an element of Christian faith (ii. 15; iv. 14; v. 10). In the next group of letters is found Paul's largest testimony to the historic facts of the life of Christ. To the Romans he wrote repeatedly of his death and resurrection (iii. 25; v. 8; vi. 10; i. 4; vi. 9). He also asserted to them that Jesus was a Jew, and, in particular, a descendant of David[1] (i. 3; ix. 5). The Corinthians

[1] It is an erroneous idea that by the expression "seed of David" (Rom. i. 3) Paul intended to teach anything concerning the paternity of Jesus; on the contrary it would be far more reasonable to press the phrase "born of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4) as implying the miraculous conception, especially

are told that he had brothers, one of whom is named to the Galatians (I. Cor. ix. 5; Gal. i. 19). Incidentally two other facts touching his life are mentioned to the Corinthians, his poverty and his purity of behavior and character reaching even to actual sinlessness (II. Cor. viii. 9; v. 21). His work as a teacher is also referred to (I. Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25), and his teachings are manifestly regarded as absolutely authoritative to the church. The form of his death is often alluded to (I. Cor. i. 13, 17, 18; ii. 2; Gal. ii. 20; iii. 1, 13), and the story of the institution of the Supper is given (I. Cor. xi. 23–26) with a fullness of detail that includes even the mention that it was night and the night of the betrayal. Burial is also asserted (I. Cor. xv. 4; Rom. vi. 4). Resurrection is repeatedly asserted (Rom. iv. 25; vi. 4; viii. 11; II. Cor. v. 15), and the resurrection story is told with

as this fact is related by Luke, the Pauline evangelist, with greater fullness than is found in any other Gospel. The same passage states also the relation of Christ to the law of his nation.

great clearness and force (I. Cor. xv. 1–8), this being, so far as is known, the first time that ever it was penned. The prison and pastoral letters confirm this teaching concerning Jesus (Col. i. 20; ii. 14; Eph. ii. 16; Phil. ii. 8; II. Tim. ii. 8), the only enlargement being the reference (I. Tim. vi. 13) to Pontius Pilate.

The letter to the Hebrews, although personal observation of the facts had been lacking on the part of both writer and readers (ii. 3), yet confirms the other epistles and adds to what is supplied in them. Jesus was of the tribe of Judah (vii. 14); his life was characterized by suffering (ii. 10; v. 8) and temptations (ii. 18; iv. 15), but never by sin (iv. 15; vii. 26); he prayed and once at least his prayer burst forth with strong crying and even tears (v. 7); he died upon the cross outside the gate of Jerusalem (ii. 9; vi. 6; ix. 12, 28; xii. 2; xiii. 12); and after death he was brought up from the dead (xiii. 20) and ascended to the right hand of God (i. 3; viii. 1; xii. 2).

So far as the historic facts in relation to

Jesus are concerned, there is in all the epistles no token of record or tradition inconsistent with the Gospel narratives. Though many details carefully given by the evangelists find no mention, not necessarily as unknown, still less as erroneous or doubtful, but simply as lying outside the scope and purpose of the writers, yet the traits given in the epistles, even in the practically undisputed Pauline epistles alone, cannot be combined into a single portrait without its agreeing in all essential particulars with that in the Gospels. No less than the following is furnished in the epistles: a man of the nation of Israel, of the tribe of Judah and of the lineage of David, of whose mother and brothers there is also mention, lives a life of poverty; his life in spite of temptation is of absolutely fleckless purity; his teaching is characterized by originality and authority; he prayed with tears and strong crying; he was the victim of a traitor; his own nation rejected him and asked for a murderer in place of him; his trial before Pilate and Herod resulted in his scourging

and crucifixion, sufferings which were borne in silent patience; even before his betrayal he had given a memorial of his death in the use of the loaf and the cup; his burial was followed on the third day by resurrection, that is, by resumption of body, and exit from the tomb, which was attested by a series of unmistakable appearances to chosen witnesses, and the career was closed by ascension to heaven.

CHAPTER III

THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS TO HIMSELF

In studying the teachings of the New Testament as to the rank, character and nature of Jesus, we of course begin with his own testimony to himself as it is found in the synoptic reports. First to be considered is his claim of authority. As a teacher he claimed to possess authority supreme and not to be disputed. The Jews of Christ's day fully accepted the authoritativeness of the Old Testament as a divine revelation, and Jesus did not dissent from this view but emphatically ratified it; yet he unhesitatingly set his own teaching over against it as equal or even superior to it (Matt. v. 21, 22, 27, 28, 33, 34, 38, 39; xix. 8, 9). He declares that his predictions cannot possibly fail (Matt. xxiv. 35; Lk. xxi. 33). He asserted his right to prescribe as to fasting, the Sab-

bath, defilement and marriage (Mk. ii. 18–22, 28; vii. 18, 19; x. 11, 12). He claimed to work miracles on his own authority, commanding the sea, the demons and the dead (Mk. iv. 39; v. 8; Lk. vii. 14). He even claimed power to forgive sins, and, in the face of the protest of his opponents, employed miracle as a confirmation of this claim (Mk. ii. 10, 11). He declared himself to be the rightful center of human thought and sentiment, and made relation to himself to be the only supreme concern of men, parallel even to the relation to the Father (Matt. v. 11; x. 32, 33, 37; xi. 28; xix. 29; xxiii. 8–10; Mk. viii. 38; Lk. vii. 23; xiii. 34; xix. 40). Lastly, he claimed to be the final arbiter of the eternal destinies of men (Matt. xxv. 31–34, 41, 46).

Jesus further claimed to be the Messiah, long promised to the Jewish nation and in his day earnestly desired by them. To be sure his character and work as Messiah differed in many respects from their preconceptions, and this fact at once necessitated and explains, in part at

least, the reserve which, according to the synoptic reports, he exercised in putting forth his claim of Messiahship. As the people were expecting a merely political deliverer and prince, had he immediately and conspicuously advanced his claim, there would have been danger that political devotion would forestall religious faith; that even on the part of true followers earthly ideals, expectations and plans would obscure heavenly. Indeed, this danger was not fully escaped in spite of his reserve (Mk. x. 37; Acts i. 6). The title "Son of David" probably signified successor rather than descendant of David, and consequently it was a Messianic title, but when used in addressing Jesus it never was disclaimed by him, or in any way objected to (Matt. ix. 27; xv. 22; xx. 30; xxi. 9). An unmistakable instance of acceptance by Jesus of the Messianic dignity was his response to the epochal confession of Peter at Cesarea Philippi, when the apostle's definite avowal of recognition of him as the Christ was explicitly welcomed (Matt. xvi. 16, 17). The previous message of

Jesus to John (Matt. xi. 2–6), while not directly asserting his Messiahship, fully implied it, especially when taken in relation to the question of the Baptist which evoked it. Finally, at the crisis alike of his life and of his relations to the Jewish nation, both before the Sanhedrin and before Pilate, Jesus accepted and assented to Messianic titles such as Christ and King of the Jews, in such a way that it may fairly be said that he died in the maintenance of his Messianic claims (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64, 68; xxvii. 40–43; Mk. xiv. 61, 62; xv. 18; Lk. xxii. 67–70; xxiii. 2, 3, 35–37).

The record in the Gospel of John makes a no less clear and strong impression than the synoptic record as to the claim of Jesus that his teaching was authoritative, for he even asserts that it was divine (Jn. viii. 28; xiv. 10, 23, 24; xv. 15). His miracles, even the raising of Lazarus, though depending on his relation to the Father, are yet done in his own name (ii. 8, 11; iv. 50; vi. 11; ix. 7; xi. 41–43). The acceptance of his teaching and of himself

are made no less vital and essential in the fourth Gospel than in the other three (vi. 29, 35, 37, 40, 51–58; vii. 37, 38; viii. 12, 19, 24; xi. 25, 26; xiv. 1). The claim to be the final judge is here definitely advanced, and with it the no less stupendous claim that he possessed the power to bring about the general resurrection (v. 22, 28, 29; xi. 25). The assertion that he was the long promised and eagerly expected Messiah appears in the fourth Gospel more rather than less than in the synoptic Gospels. Indeed, the earlier and clearer acceptance and assertion of the title (i. 49; iv. 25, 26; x. 24, 25; xi. 27) has often been used as an argument against the authenticity of the fourth Gospel; but, while there is manifest difference, it has not yet been shown that it amounts to contradiction or absolute inconsistency.

As to his own humanity, it can hardly be said that Jesus furnished distinct and formal testimony. Such testimony, as a matter of fact, would have been superfluous, for of course during his lifetime no one could have failed to

recognize and accept the fact. The historical problem is, rather, to explain how the apostles and early church, assured on the basis of the Old Testament revelation that God is infinitely transcendent, could ever come to the conviction of the incarnation of deity in Christ. It may, however, be noted that the sayings of Jesus often imply his real and complete humanity. He accepts for himself the name and the relations of man (Matt. iv. 4). He speaks of his body, soul and spirit (Matt. xxvi. 12, 38; Lk. xxiii. 46). He often prays. On one occasion (Mk. xiii. 32) he positively asserts the limitation of his knowledge, and he calls his teaching a man's speaking the truth (Jn. viii. 40), although, on the other hand, he never shows the slightest distrust of the authority, trustworthiness and sufficiency of his teachings, and no more recognizes a possibility of his fallibility than of his sinfulness.

In all the Gospels appears in substance the claim of Jesus to sinless perfection. It has been asserted that once (Mk. x. 18; Lk. xviii. 19) he

disclaimed sinlessness, but no acknowledgment of sinfulness can be found in this passage. An epithet which had been used without thoughtful conviction of its fitness, with intent, rather, to flatter him, Jesus waives by pointing to him who alone is the one invariable and immutable standard of right, but he makes no confession, he gives no hint of any nonconformity to this standard on his own part. His absolute freedom from all sin he once positively asserted (Jn. viii. 46), an assertion no less unmistakable and emphatic because interrogative in form, an assertion which, when taken in its relations to the circumstances in which it was spoken, must be considered the most emphatic disclaimer possible of all consciousness of any sin working or lurking in his soul. While in its definiteness this expression stands alone, there are found elsewhere expressions which are substantially equivalent in their implication of the same consciousness of absolute freedom from sin or sinfulness in every form (Jn. v. 19, 30; viii. 29, 34–36; xiv. 30, 31). Indeed, if nowhere else

distinctly asserted, his spotless holiness is yet implied in all that Jesus ever said of himself. He spoke fully of duty, he spoke frankly of himself, he demanded penitence of every other, and he never gave sign of it on his own part. He described purity lovingly and impurity loathingly as no other ever did; he searched the secrets of men's souls and sounded the depths of his own nature as no other ever did; yet he never showed sign of penitence, never confessed wrong act, word or thought; never coupled himself in these relations with other men (Matt. vi. 9, 13, 14; vii. 11; Jn. iii. 7); never in the slightest degree seemed to recognize the possibility of sin on his own part. This lack of consciousness of sin, unique, unparalleled in any degree, most unlike to those who most aspire and endeavor to copy his life, accompanied as this consciousness was by an equally peculiar sensitiveness to sin in its every form and degree, is a phenomenon wholly inexplicable save as we accept the unique fact of the absolutely sinless holiness of Jesus from birth to death.

As to the favorite name of Jesus for himself, "Son of man," its original significance and the full nature and extent of the claims involved in it have been matters of prolonged debate, and as yet there is no unanimity of opinion. It is sufficiently clear that historically it connects itself with the prophecy of Daniel (vii. 13, 14), and so it must involve more than a mere suggestion of Messiahship. As being thus more suggestive than the simple personal pronoun, while at the same time by its lack of definite assertion it avoided any undesirable results which might have grown out of a positive and unmistakable claim of Messiahship, it seems to have especially commended itself to Jesus. Beyond this veiled affirmation of Christhood, certain other ideas are in addition more or less clearly involved in this title. It necessarily assumed and was based upon the full humanity of Jesus. It may well be that the chief reason why the use of this name, which had been so common with Jesus himself, did not extend to the apostles and dominate their teaching, lay

in the very fact of the more or less conscious recognition of this implication of humanity, they desiring and needing to lay their emphasis on other elements in his nature and work which had come to be more significant and important. Again, both the implication of Messiahship which belongs to this title and the prefixing to it of the definite article justify the view that this term involved the conception that Jesus is the ideal and representative man, an idea which is elsewhere expressed by Paul alone and by him in an entirely different way. By this phrase Jesus gave at least a suggestion that he is the man who is at the same time the head of the race of which he had become a part, and the head of the coming kingdom of God.

No less striking and important in its lessons is the designation of himself by Jesus as the "Son of God." Various meanings may be and have been assigned to this phrase. It might have been related to the fact that by divine power he was born of the Virgin Mary with no earthly father, a merely historical conception.

It might assert sonship on the basis of moral likeness, an ethical conception underlying the title. Again, it might have been employed to assert his rank as God's representative, an official conception. Or, lastly, it might be an expression of his essential and eternal divinity, a metaphysical conception. Of these meanings it does not appear that the first, the historical, was ever the basis of any language spoken by Jesus, addressed to him or used about him during his lifetime. It is, then, more than unlikely that this thought can be the ground of the title. That the second, the ethical meaning, is the chief, if not the sole, sense to be put upon it in the teachings of Jesus is often asserted; yet from the facts that the phrase is constantly used in the singular number and with the definite article; that the Jews charged him with making God his own Father (Jn. v. 18) and that their understanding of his language was not corrected but accepted by him; that the relation which he asserted to exist between himself and the Father is such as cannot be ascribed to any

other person; that he sets the Son apart from all other men and ranks him between the angels and the Father (Mk. xiii. 32); and that he never associated any others with himself in the relation of sonship which he claimed for himself, but always recognized a distinction (Matt. v. 48; vi. 9, 32; xi. 27; Jn. xx. 17);— from these facts it is to be inferred that though the ethical sonship which may belong to men in general may be fitly attributed to Jesus and has been perfectly exemplified by him and by him alone, yet this does not exhaust the relation of sonship which he sustained to God, but that in his case this sonship was something necessarily unique. This special significance was in part official. As employed by Nathanael, by Martha and by the high priest at his trial (Jn. i. 49; xi. 27; Matt. xxvi. 63), in all which cases it was accepted without protest by Jesus himself, it is sufficiently clear that the title was regarded as practically synonymous with Messiah, a usage probably based on the Second Psalm and finding its fullest New Testament development in the

epistle to the Hebrews. So, too, it remains to be shown that the language of Peter in his great confession (Matt. xvi. 16) is to be taken in any other than the official sense. It is to be noted that in the synoptic Gospels the exact phrase "Son of God" is lacking from the lips of Jesus himself, but the conception for which this is the chosen expression in the fourth Gospel, is necessarily involved in the records of the first three Gospels, as otherwise many expressions which do occur in the synoptic record would be wholly unintelligible. For example, the antithesis of Son and Father (Matt. xi. 27; Mk. xiii. 32), the emphatic "my Father" or "his Father" (Matt. xi. 27; xii. 50; xvi. 27; xviii. 10), and the contrast of son and servants in the parable of the unfaithful husbandmen (Lk. xx. 13, 14), all demand for their satisfactory explanation more than a merely ethical sonship, however developed and completed. By its necessary implications, then, the synoptic teaching is in the fullest harmony with the detailed and definite teaching which is preserved in the fourth Gospel. John,

like the other evangelists, speaks often of "the Father" and "the Son," "my Father" and "Thy Son" (v. 19–23, 43; vi. 37, 46; x. 15, 29, 32, 36–38; xii. 26; xvii. 1), and, further, he frequently employs the complete phrase "Son of God" (v. 25; x. 36; xi. 4). It is impossible by a merely ethical conception of sonship, based solely upon likeness of character, satisfactorily to explain the phrase in the connections in which it occurs. Simple likeness in goodness cannot properly be held to justify all these declarations; a really metaphysical conception must underlie these statements, the thought of a peculiar, exceptional, unique, personal relation, a more or less fully developed idea of a unity with God in nature as well as in character.

Jesus further clearly testified to his own pre-existence. He asserted, according to the report of John, that he came forth from God, came down from heaven and came into the world (vi. 38; xvi. 27, 28); he spoke of ascending where he was before (vi. 62), mentioned the glory which he shared with the Father before

the creation (xvii. 5), and, to correct the misapprehension of the Jews, at the risk of life itself, he distinctly declared "Before Abraham was, I am" (viii. 58). That in the synoptic Gospels these or similar assertions of preëxistence are lacking will not cause surprise when it is remembered that both the discourses in which they occur and in fact, almost all accounts of his controversies with the Jewish authorities at Jerusalem, as well as the high-priestly prayer, are omitted in these Gospels. It has, however, been acutely argued[1] that his adoption of the title "Son of man" for himself is not fully explicable except on the ground that it implied and assumed a consciousness that the speaker was in some sense other than man and more than merely human; that it could never have occurred to one whose consciousness was limited to the period of his earthly existence and the relations of human life, to throw such peculiar and constant stress,

[1] Professor G. F. Wright, D.D., Bibliotheca Sacra, 1887, pp. 575–601.

— as if he could never quite lose his sense of its strangeness — on that humanity which he shared with all his brethren. If this view commends itself, it will appear that the synoptical Gospels really do contain testimony to Christ's consciousness of his own superhuman preëxistence, testimony all the stronger because informal and indirect and, in some sense, unintended.

That any formal assertion by Jesus of his own divinity is lacking in all the Gospels, is in no way surprising when it is remembered that his task was not to give metaphysical lectures on the mysteries of his own nature, but to live out the unique self-revelation of God, and that the Gospels in turn are not philosophical treatises, but historical narratives. It has been argued that in one discussion Jesus even used language which amounts to a disclaimer of his divinity (Jn. x. 34–36), but, while to be sure there is here a lack of positive assertion, it yet cannot fairly be said that there is a real disclaimer; and simple silence, however strange,

mere lack of assertion, however inexplicable it may appear to us, cannot on this point be considered decisive. Jesus here makes the perfectly relevant plea that such language as had been objected to by his opponents was not punishable because Old Testament parallels justified its application even to men, much more to himself. Again, the distinct assertion of his subordination to the Father which Jesus repeatedly made (Jn. v. 19; x. 29; xiv. 28), as well as the constant implication of it, especially in the fact of prayer to the Father, has been regarded as inconsistent with the actual divinity of his nature. But this view overlooks the obvious distinction between inferiority of nature and subordination of office and work. The latter fact is enough of itself to explain the language of Christ, although it is not to be forgotten that the fact of incarnation had come in to increase to an unknown degree the subordination which originally existed. In reference to the unity in action with the Father, which Christ claimed (Jn. x. 30), what has been called

the "dynamic fellowship," it may be said that it would certainly be more perfect if unity of nature also, metaphysical oneness of essence, underlay it, though it can hardly be insisted that the latter is indispensable to it. But it should be carefully noted that the synoptic records also show that early in his ministry, even in the face of a charge of blasphemy on account of it, Jesus, while not entering on any discussion of his nature, yet quietly and positively assumed to exercise divine prerogatives (Matt. ix. 2–6; Mk. ii. 5–11; Lk. v. 20–24). Again the puzzling and yet, when answered, profoundly instructive question which at the very end of his ministry Jesus left ringing in the ears of the Pharisees (Matt. xxii. 43–45), involves in its complete answer the full divinity of David's Son, and it is most reasonable to hold that Jesus recognized the implication and asked the question because he intended to teach the fact. Finally, on at least one occasion, he accepted the formal acknowledgment of his deity, for Thomas acknowledged him as God

(Jn. xx. 28), and for this outburst Jesus had only praise.

When, with the conception of a sonship based on a unique unity with God are combined Christ's hints of preëxistence, his suggestions and implications of divinity, and his welcome to the assertion of his deity, it will appear that at least the foundation for the doctrine which was later developed as to the eternal sonship of the divine Christ was to a considerable extent already laid in his own teaching.

CHAPTER IV

THE APOSTOLIC DOCTRINE CONCERNING CHRIST

It should occasion no surprise that in respect to the nature and rank of Christ, as will later be found to be true in reference to his work and also to the Christian life, the teaching of the apostles is in many respects developed beyond that of Jesus himself. Even if during his life among men Jesus was fully conscious of all the truth relating to himself, certainly he did not exhaust the contents of his consciousness even in his fullest and frankest disclosures to his most intimate friends, and he led them to expect that the guidance of the promised Spirit would result in larger, clearer knowledge than his own instructions had brought them (Jn. xvi. 12–15). We find that Paul definitely attributes his "gospel," from which it would be absurd to eliminate his

views as to the rank and character of Jesus, to "revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. i. 11, 12). Whatever the grounds on which the apostles based their teaching, — on additional though unrecorded discourses of Jesus (Lk. xxiv. 27; Acts i. 3), on inferences inevitably and legitimately drawn from the facts of the resurrection and ascension, on meditations controlled and illuminated by the Spirit, or on special revelation, — at any rate the doctrine of the apostles, though nowhere inconsistent with the testimony of Jesus himself, is in many respects fuller and clearer as to his nature and rank.

In the apostolic teaching the full humanity of Jesus is emphatically recognized. Whatever might be added to it and combined with it, this truth always held its place, being taught not only by unmistakable implications but also by direct assertions. The apostolic testimony as to the life history of Jesus has already been discussed. It is now to be noted in addition that Peter began his preaching by calling him "a man" (Acts ii. 22, 23), and that he later

spoke of Christ's blood and body and of his suffering and being put to death in the flesh (I. Pet. i. 19; ii. 24; iii. 18; iv. 1). In the epistle to the Hebrews the tribal descent of Christ, his human nature and his fellowship with his brethren are strenuously insisted upon (ii. 14; iv. 15; v. 7; vii. 14). The synoptic Gospels cannot fail to satisfy the reader that the fact of the true manhood of Christ was fully accepted by the early church. This is confirmed by the teaching of Paul. To the Athenians he spoke of Jesus as "a man" (Acts xvii. 31), and he wrote to the Philippians that he was "found in fashion as a man" (ii. 8) and to the Romans that he was sent "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (viii. 3). Most decisive as to Paul's conception, however, is the parallel which he twice draws between Adam whom he regarded as the representative of mankind in its present condition, and "the one man, Jesus Christ" (Rom. v. 14, 15), or "the second man" (I. Cor. xv. 45, 47). In the writings of John, especially in the first epistle, the teaching

concerning the humanity of Jesus becomes even more pointed and emphatic. In manifest opposition to heretical tendencies of a Docetic sort, which must already have become more or less prevalent, he declares in the prologue to the fourth Gospel that "the Word became flesh" (i. 14), lays peculiar stress on the spear thrust and its consequences (xix. 34, 35), begins the first epistle with the assertion of sight and hearing and handling of the eternal Word in his historic relations (i. 1–3), and makes the doctrine that the coming of Christ is "in the flesh" to be the decisive test whether the spirit is of God or of antichrist (iv. 3; II. Jn. 7).

While the apostles thus set forth the true and full humanity of Jesus, their teaching does not stop with that. While it represents him as being really a man like other men, it nowhere represents him as being merely a man like other men. In part his difference from his brethren is made to depend on his character (Rom. viii. 3; Heb. iv. 15); but still more is it made to depend on his peculiar office. The

Messiahship of Jesus was to the whole church from the beginning a fact established beyond reasonable doubt. With this thought Peter began the proclamation of Christianity (Acts ii. 36), and its continued dominance is indisputable. The facts, that the title Christ was continually given to Jesus until, dropping the article, it ceased to be descriptive and became a proper name, and that early in the century the disciples were called Christians, attest, though attestation is on this point really needless, how unceasingly and emphatically the Messiahship of Jesus was everywhere taught. Almost at once it was recognized that all the old prophetic conceptions of "the Coming One" found fulfillment in Jesus. Repeatedly he is styled the "Servant of God," a name manifestly drawn from the latter part of the book of Isaiah (Acts iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30). Once (Acts vii. 37) he is regarded as the "Prophet" foretold by Moses (Deut. xviii. 15, 18), a conception so familiar to the Jewish people (Jn. i. 21, 45; vii. 40) that the practical disuse of it most

significantly illustrates how completely the prophetic element in the work of Jesus was overshadowed after his death by its other elements. The form which the Messianic conception chiefly assumed in relation to Jesus was that of the King already reigning and sure to return and to manifest his power and his glory. In his Pentecost speech Peter couples (Acts ii. 34–36) the idea of lordship with that of Messiahship, and applies to the exalted Jesus Psalm cx. with its assertion of royalty. Later, he declared (v. 31) that Jesus is Prince as well as Saviour, and finally he wrote (I. Pet. iii. 22) that he is "on the right hand of God . . . angels and authorities and powers being made subject to him." In Hebrews we find the repeated ascription to Jesus of the place on the right hand of God (i. 3, 13 ; x. 12), and this ascription, as well as the whole application to him of Psalms ii. and cx., necessarily implies his royalty. In the thinking of Paul, the conception of the kingship of Christ was not at all weakened by the elimination of

all narrow, Jewish notions of a purely political and temporal reign over a worldly kingdom of which Israel should be the center. It was rather intensified by this change, as much as it was elevated and broadened (I. Cor. xv. 25–27; Eph. i. 20–22; Phil. ii. 9–11; Col. ii. 10). In the Revelation the very theme of the book throws the kingship of Christ into prominence, though from the subject and character of the epistles of John this thought found little place in them (Rev. i. 5, 6; xi. 15; xii. 10; xvii. 14; xix. 16; xxii. 3).

The term, Lord, probably involved in its first application to Jesus chiefly the idea of authority (Acts ii. 36), but it is manifest that it soon came to include other ideas and consequently to have a loftier significance. As the thought of the kingdom grew in the minds of the apostles to be universal and eternal, so the thought of the King must in any case have been correspondingly extended and exalted, but this fact alone would not have transformed the whole conception of the nature of Jesus. Of

course it may be claimed that, as the name, Lord, was ambiguous, having been used in Hebrew and by the Septuagint translators to represent the unpronounced and untranslatable name, so this ambiguity would contribute to the development of the idea of the divinity of Christ. Such a claim, however, could only be made when the real conditions of the case were overlooked. We have a case, not of the misunderstanding of a title of longstanding application, when of course ambiguity might lead to error, but of the fresh bestowment of a title. Up to the time of the apostles, the only religious use of the title, Lord, had been as a substitute for the most sacred of all the names of God himself. Unless they had been at least indifferent to the attribution of divinity to Jesus, the apostles never could have called him, Lord, as they did (Jas. ii. 1 ; I. Pet. iii. 15 ; Rom. xiv. 6, 8, 9 ; II. Cor. v. 11 ; Phil. ii. 11). When, however, we find prayer and worship addressed to the Lord Jesus Christ (II. Cor. xii. 8 ; I. Cor. i. 2), it is plain that the name, Lord, was ap-

plied to Jesus in conscious recognition of his deity.

The doctrine of the preëxistence of Christ was common to all the apostolic circles. From the pen of James it is lacking, and Peter gives it only a small place, the fact in both cases being doubtless due to the intensely practical character of the writings and the narrow range of their theological thought. But, according to the safer, even if at present less popular, interpretation of Peter's statement as to the preaching to the dead (I. Pet. iii. 19, 20), he gives in this passage a decisive declaration as to the activity of Christ in the days of Noah. Even from Paul the assertion of the preëxistence of Christ is only occasional, yet it is positive and unmistakable, and in its tone implies that the thought was already familiar to those addressed. While it cannot be safely asserted that the great doctrine of the Second Man who is from heaven itself necessarily implies the conception of preexistence, yet this conception is involved and plainly confirmed by clear teaching in the third

group of letters. The declaration that creation took place through Christ (Col. i. 15, 16), not only is unambiguous in itself, but also puts beyond question the significance in this relation of the earlier assertion that all things are through him (I. Cor. viii. 6), and is in its turn strengthened by the statement that he is the bond of the universe (Col. i. 17). The mention of the earlier existence of Christ Jesus "in the form of God" (Phil. ii. 6, 7) confirms the implication of preëxistence which is involved in the self-impoverishment of Christ (II. Cor. viii. 9). Existence in the form of God, creation, permanent support of the universe, self-emptying, self-impoverishment — Paul could not without self-stultification have taught these, unless at the same time he held to the preëxistence of Christ. This being then the belief of the apostle, it becomes reasonable to hold that the passages which speak of the sending of the Son (Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 4) are based upon the same conception and are explained by it. In the epistle to the Hebrews the preëxistence of Christ is

not so much frequently asserted as constantly assumed. The characteristics which are attributed to Melchisedek are made to remind the readers of the eternity of Christ (vii. 3). Like Paul the author of this epistle also makes Christ to be the creator and upholder of the universe (i. 2, 3, 10), speaks of his coming into the world (x. 5) and being made a little lower than the angels (ii. 9), and his death is referred to as the activity of a spiritual nature which is forever changelessly the same (ix. 14). On this point the Christology of John is in substance wholly accordant with the rest of the New Testament, although in form it is somewhat different. John's most striking peculiarity consists in applying to Jesus the title, Logos or Word. In connection with this teaching (Jn. i. 1–18) the same Word who became flesh is declared to have been in the beginning; to have been in the beginning in relations with God; to have been the agent in creation and to have been the source of the light of the universe, if not also of its life. In fullest harmony

with this teaching in thought, even though lacking the name, Logos, is the rest of the teaching of John, that Christ was from the beginning (I. Jn. i. 1–3 ; ii. 13, 14), and that he was sent or given, and came in flesh or became flesh (Jn. iii. 16, 17[1]; I. Jn. iv. 3, 14 ; II. Jn. 7).

The doctrine of the preëxistence of Christ leads naturally to the consideration of the apostolic teaching in reference to the nature, relations and activity of Christ before his incarnation. The terms most often used in describing the relation of Christ to God are "Father" and "Son." In the Gospels of Matthew and Luke we have two distinct but not inconsistent accounts of the miraculous conception of the child Jesus by the Virgin Mary through the power of the Holy Spirit, and Luke definitely adds that on this account Jesus should be called the Son of God (i. 35). But while these accounts are to be accepted as authentic and as

[1] If these verses (Jn. iii. 16, 17) are understood as spoken by Jesus, a significant use of the word, Son, must be added to the list of Christ's own uses, and another claim of preëxistence on his part must be recognized.

preserving the very earliest Christian tradition, yet they cannot be the basis of the apostolic doctrine that Jesus is the Son of God, for there is not a single doctrinal passage where the relations of thought require or even permit the assumption that the miraculous conception was regarded as the basis of sonship. But this lack of reference, in the speeches and letters of the apostles, to the fact of the miraculous conception is not to be taken as casting doubt upon it, but only as showing that, so far as it was known, it must have been regarded as having a historic rather than a dogmatic value.

All the important implications of Christ's teaching concerning himself are repeated in substance by his apostles, with varying frequency and emphasis which depend on individual differences of standpoint and expression. Of the use of the title, Son of God, in the official sense there are clear instances in the synoptic Gospels (Matt. iv. 3, 6; xiv. 33), and there are passages where it is ambiguous (Matt. iii. 17; xvii. 5; Mk. i. 1[1]; iii. 11; v. 7), but there is

[1] If genuine.

no passage where it is unmistakably employed in the metaphysical sense. One of the instances of this ambiguous use is repeated by Peter (II. Pet. i. 17), of course retaining the same ambiguity. The metaphysical conception of sonship did not prevail any more widely in the original apostolic preaching. In the Acts the phrase occurs but once (ix. 20), and there it is probably to be explained as an example of the official sense. In James the sonship of Christ is not touched upon. In Peter and Jude it is given, with the exception noted above, only as it is implied in calling God the "Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" and simply "Father" (I. Pet. i. 2, 3; II. Pet. i. 17; Jude 1), usage too vague to yield certain conclusions. In the writings of Paul the sonship of Christ is continually brought to the front. In his teaching the incarnation was the sending of the Son; the resurrection was the certification of sonship; the apostolic experience was the inward revelation of the Son; the sphere of the apostolic ministry is the Gospel of God's Son; the

present kingdom is the kingdom of the Son; Christian hope is a waiting for the Son from heaven (I. Th. i. 10; I. Cor. xv. 24; Gal. i. 16; Rom. i. 4, 9; Col. i. 13). When all these elements are combined, it seems decidedly best to explain Paul's conception as metaphysical in its character. In the letter to the Hebrews, sonship, like so much else, is implied instead of asserted. Christ is many times called "Son" (i. 5, 8; iii. 6; v. 8; vii. 3, 28; x. 29), but the author does not so much seem to be teaching something new as to be using a familiar title to prove or at least to indicate special rank. The fact that in some of its aspects the sonship of Christ was due to a special exercise of the divine will and manifestation of the divine power, is more than once brought out in the use of a familiar quotation from the Psalms (Ps. ii. 7: Heb. i. 5; v. 5), which passage found its first recorded application to Jesus in a speech of Paul (Acts xiii. 33). The official conception of Christ's sonship seems to prevail in this epistle largely if not exclusively.

In the writings of John the thought of Christ's sonship fills an even larger place than elsewhere. His Gospel was avowedly written to confirm belief that Jesus was the Son of God, and while this end was gained rather by depicting him as Son than by calling him so, yet the title itself is repeatedly employed, and twice he is called the only-begotten (Jn. i. 18; iii. 16, 17, 35, 36; xx. 31). In the epistles, which were written not to secure faith itself, but the fruits of faith in those who were already believers (I. Jn. i. 3; v. 13), Jesus is styled, Son, more than a score of times. The conception of the sonship of Christ in the mind of this apostle seems to have been, not official, like that of the writer to the Hebrews, but metaphysical, like Paul's. He would not speak of Christ's becoming the Son, for his thought was that he is eternally and changelessly the Son. His sonship depended, not on what he was to others, but on what he was in himself.

The sonship of Christ, in the thought of the apostles, as in the consciousness of Jesus him-

self, was, at least in its most important aspects, something unique and peculiar to himself alone. To be sure, the same word was figuratively used of the relation to God of believers also (Rom. viii. 14, 19, 29; Heb. ii. 10; xii. 5–9), but the apostles manifestly thought of the relation of Christ to the Father as distinct in character and much loftier, as is indicated by Paul's word "own" and John's "only-begotten" (Rom. viii. 3; Jn. i. 18; iii. 16). This unique sonship, which is never once based on moral likeness, can be satisfactorily explained only as based on community of nature, only as it is recognized that Christ shared the divine essence. This conclusion is confirmed by a review of the activities which have been found to be attributed to Christ. Creation, the upholding of the universe, worship even from angels, — these attributes, with others like them, could have seemed to the first apostles no less than divine.

As a result, finally, they came to apply the very name of the deity to Christ. This was not, however, done indiscriminately, for, though

presumably having no scheme of trinitarian relations wrought out and carried along in their minds, they yet unconsciously observed these relations, reserving, for example, the name, God, when it is accompanied with the article, for the Father supreme (Jn. i. 1). The appellation, Lord, which is next in point of loftiness of significance to the direct use of the name, God, is — as has already been noted — freely bestowed upon Christ. Paul assures us that Christ is the image of the invisible God (Col. i. 15), that before his humiliation he existed in the form of God (Phil. ii. 6), and that during his incarnation the whole fullness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily (Col. ii. 9) : it is a very short step further to give him the very name itself, as it appears that once at least Paul actually did (Rom. ix. 5 ; compare Tit. ii. 13). The writer to the Hebrews calls him the effulgence of the divine glory, and declares his exact correspondence to the substance of God himself (i. 3), and is so thoroughly convinced that Christ is divine, and is so sure that his readers

are similarly convinced, that, without any formal justification or explanation whatever, he transferred to Christ prophecies which to be sure were fulfilled only in him, but which when originally spoken referred to God without any recognition of distinctions in the Godhead (i. 8–12). John in the prologue to his Gospel probably used the remarkable phrase "God only begotten" (i. 18), and unquestionably declared that the Word was God (i. 1). The necessary conclusion as to the apostles' conception of the nature of Jesus is ratified and confirmed by their ascriptions of unity of action to the Father and the Son (II. Cor. v. 19; I. Jn. v. 20). The apostolic doctrine as to Christ culminates in the unanimous acknowledgment of his deity.

CHAPTER V

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD

It is to be noted first that the teaching of the New Testament in relation to God is in no sense independent, but was very closely related to the thoughts of the time, and especially to the theology of the Old Testament, to which it is more or less supplement and correction, and by the aid of which it must consequently be interpreted. For instance there is much which Jesus never asserted about God because it needed no assertion. His existence, his unity, his transcendence, his glory, all these great facts are presupposed as already known and accepted, and are not repeated because the aim of Jesus was practical, not doctrinal; religious, not systematic.

In the synoptic Gospels the only metaphysical teaching of Christ in reference to God is

contained in the quotation from Deuteronomy to the questioning lawyer (Deut. vi. 4 ; Mk. xii. 29), a passage which declares his unity. The chief thought in Christ's teaching about God is his love. This statement does not require proof texts for its confirmation so much as it does a sympathetic study of all that Jesus said about God. He makes his sun to rise on both evil and good ; his rain comes on both just and unjust ; he cares for the sparrows, the ravens and the lilies ; better than any earthly father he knows how to give good things to those that ask him (Matt. v. 45 ; vii. 11 ; x. 29 ; Lk. xii. 6, 24–31). The crown of perfectness for even divine goodness is especially found in kindness to the unworthy (Matt. v. 48). This teaching about the divine love for the undeserving reaches its climax in the parables about the recovery of the lost. The joy in the presence of the angels (Lk. xv. 10) can be none other than the joy of God himself. While Pharisees have no welcome for penitent sinners, the heart of God is drawn out unceasingly with all the

patience of a father's unwearied affection for the most wayward, and he ever joyfully welcomes the penitent soul (Lk. xv. 32). The unweariedly patient love of God is most forcibly set forth in the parable of the "Prodigal Son," usually so called, though to suggest all the lessons of the story some such cumbrous phrase would be needed as the following, "The lost son, returning, welcomed and unwelcomed." The winning tenderness of this parable is such that some have made it the controlling, not to say the sole, element in Christ's teaching about God, and his doctrine is often summed up in a single phrase, "The Fatherhood of God." To the use of this phrase there need be no objection in itself, even if it does harden into dogma the drapery of a parable. The objections which might be raised would be, first, that the name Father is reserved by Jesus himself to express, not the general relation of God to men at large, but the special relation which he sustains to believers, or the unique relation to the divine Son; and, second, that, if universal Fatherhood

is unconditionally ascribed to God, the erroneous inference may be drawn that all men sustain in a religious sense a real sonship to God, — an inference which some have drawn. To be sure, not only does Christ often speak of "my Father" and "your Father," but he often speaks also of "the Father," and this usage has been held to justify the assertion of a universal Fatherhood. But so far as we can enter into the thought of Jesus we come to think, not only that it would be necessary for him to feel the consciousness of his own sonship before he could know the sonship of other men in even a remoter sense, but that he actually did follow this course. From the lips of the boy of twelve years, who could not be supposed already to have settled the question of the relation of mankind at large to God, fall with winsome grace the words of filial assurance, "my Father" (Lk. ii. 49). The thought of his own peculiar relation to God which he first reached continued to dominate his teaching, and it is only safe to hold that in his speech, as "the Son"

signified himself in his own unique relation to God, so "the Father" first of all signified God as especially related to himself and known by himself (Matt. xi. 27).

In the Gospel of John a superficial dissimilarity here as elsewhere is caused by its peculiar style, but there is no essential inconsistency with the synoptic teaching. In the fourth Gospel there is a little more of teaching which in form at least is metaphysical, but as in the other Gospels all has a practical, a purely religious purpose. The declaration, for example, that God is spirit (iv. 24) is a statement so profound and far-reaching that theologians are still far from exhausting its implications, but the original intent of it was to teach to an ignorant and degraded woman the character of true worship. On two occasions the unity of God is emphasized (v. 44; xvii. 3), but both times the declaration is not theoretical but practical. The Father's absolute independence in existence is mentioned (v. 26), but only to exalt the Son. From the controversial character of the Johan-

nine discourses it naturally results that less assertion of the goodness of God is found in them than in the synoptic reports. The name Father is here in frequent use, but the form in which it most often occurs is the indeterminate phrase "the Father." When the relation is defined, Jesus says "your Father" but once (xx. 17), and then to the disciples, while the words "my Father" often occur. It follows then that we should interpret the phrase "the Father," as it fell from the lips of Christ, as having reference, not to a relation of God to all men in common, or even to all believers, but to himself alone, a view which confirms the results found in reference to the synoptic thought.

The first preaching of the apostles brought no enlarged or corrected doctrine of God. It was not so much a new conception of God which men needed as a new relation to him and his Christ. The epistle of James declares his unity, his immutability, and his absolute holiness (i. 13, 17; ii. 19), and emphasis is laid both on the sternness and the kindness of God (i. 5, 17;

iv. 6, 12; v. 11). Peter bases little of his teaching on what God is, yet even in the few sentences which touch on this subject, we are reminded that he is holy, strict in judgment, and yet full of compassion and grace (I. Pet. i. 16, 17; ii. 12; iii. 12; v. 6, 10). As Jude writes exclusively in warning, he writes especially of the divine judgments (5–7), and the same note is of course echoed in II. Peter (ii. 4–10).

As would be expected, the discussions of Paul and John open on this subject still larger stores of instruction. The statements of the apostle to the Gentiles which approach most nearly to dogmatic form are the compact sentences of his address at Athens. Here, to an audience which, in intellectual preparation if not in spiritual sympathy, was fit for the theme and the speaker, he sets forth, in a manner never needed among hearers of Jewish training, his simple yet profound postulates as to the nature and relations of God (Acts xvii. 24–31). There is but one God, he tells them, supreme in all

the universe of which he was the creator. His spirituality is implied in the declaration of his unlikeness to even the most precious of material substances and in the assertion that he is the source of the life and being of all men. As such original and continual fountain of life, he may well be called our Father and we his offspring,[1] a thought for which Paul claimed no originality, but rather the confirmation of the best thought of his hearers in the past. Of the moral attributes of God there is only a single suggestion given in this incomplete address, that of righteousness or rightness in judgment. Among the Lycaonians (Acts xiv. 15–17) the fervor of Paul's sudden exclamation necessarily precluded definiteness of doctrinal statement. Yet the few sentences which he then uttered involve the thoughts, that there is unlikeness between divinity and humanity; that there is only one being who really possesses life, while the heathen deities were mere nonentities; that the living God was the crea-

[1] Compare "Father of lights" (James i. 17).

tor of the universe, and that his providential activities are proof of his goodness. In addressing Christians Paul constantly presupposes an assured knowledge of the nature and character of God, and often uses his recognized attributes to weight an argument or sharpen an appeal. Over against the idols of the heathen which have and represent no real substance, there is one God, and only one, and he alone has life (I. Cor. viii. 4–6; II. Cor. iii. 3; Gal. iv. 8). He is invisible, incorruptible, immortal, eternal (Rom. i. 20, 23; xvi. 26; Col. i. 15; I. Tim. vi. 16), all these attributes being summed up in a single doxology (I. Tim. i. 17). This God was the creator of the world (I. Cor. viii. 6; Rom. i. 25), and is its ruler, all history displaying his will (Acts xvii. 26; Rom. i. 24, 26, 28; xi. 21, 22). In his moral attributes he is wise (I. Cor. iii. 19, 20; Rom. xi. 33), just (II. Th. i. 6; Rom. ii. 2, 5, 6; iii. 5, 6), and unchangeable (I. Cor. i. 9; x. 13; Rom. iii. 3).

In the teachings which have just been noted Paul set forth, not merely facts which he had

intellectually accepted, but still more, important truths which he had spiritually appropriated. Even profounder and richer is his conception of the love of God. While, to be sure, any such single compact statement as John's "God is Love" is lacking from his pen (Paul rarely deals in epigrams), yet his whole teaching is pervaded with a sense of the love of God, and he never tires of unfolding the riches of it and magnifying the results of it as it is poured forth in our hearts. In spite of the frequency and fervor of his expressions, it has yet strangely enough been charged against him that he really nullifies and neutralizes this teaching by the stress which he lays on what is regarded as inconsistent with love and opposed to it (I. Th. i. 10; Rom. i. 18; Eph. ii. 3; v. 6). But this objection rests on the silently assumed, unproved and incorrect premise that wrath is necessarily synonymous with hatred. Paul, however, manifestly regards wrath as in no sense inconsistent with love profound, intense and changeless. He holds that, as the result

of his necessarily constant and fervent displeasure with sin, God may, must manifest wrath toward sinners in spite of his love, nay, rather, because of his holy love. With this understanding of his thought no statements of the apostle are inconsistent. When, for example, he calls sinners "hateful to God" (Rom. i. 30), this is only a forcible expression for the universally admitted opposition of God to sinners. It may also be noted that in the same breath Paul attributes to God both enmity and the laying aside of this enmity (Rom. v. 10, 11; II. Cor. v. 18, 19), and in both passages he so relates these facts to the love of God displayed in the death of his Son as to show conclusively that to his mind there was no possibility of incompatibility between love and wrath. Indeed, he holds that the sinner can be the object of the forbearance, longsuffering and goodness of God, and yet at the same time be under his wrath (Rom. i. 18; ii. 4, 5). In Paul's teaching, then, the wrath of God is not incompatible with his love. On the other hand the

wrath of God especially demonstrates his holiness, which is such that he must both feel and show wrath wherever sin exists and so long as sin exists. Because of this peculiarly keen sense of the universally deserved wrath of God (Eph. ii. 3), Paul often expresses his thought of the divine love under the name of "mercy," which emphasizes that man is wholly undeserving of God's favor (II. Cor. iv. 1; Rom. xi. 30–32; Eph. ii. 4; Tit. iii. 5), and still more often under the name of "grace," a word which calls attention to the lack of return expected or even possible (II. Th. i. 12; II. Cor. ix. 14; Rom. v. 15; Eph. i. 6, 7; ii. 7, 8; II. Tim. i. 9). Paul is preëminently apostle of mercy and grace. While he thus distinctly teaches the goodness of God toward all men with a force and fervor which has never been surpassed, he yet never chooses to state this truth as his universal Fatherhood, although he continually speaks of God as "the Father." There seem to have been two possible sources for his use of this name for God. The first was naturally the pe-

culiar sonship of Jesus (II. Cor. i. 3; Rom. xv. 6; Eph. i. 3), and the second was his no less positive conviction of the sonship of all believers, a thought which he often puts in very close connection with the first (II. Cor. i. 2; Eph. i. 2). It may be that in the phrase "the Father," which he so frequently used, he combined both ideas, just as the personal example of Jesus (Mk. xiv. 36) combined with the spiritual experience of the Christian to teach that remarkable bilingual form of address to God, "Abba, Father" (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6), which still remains the climax of tender expression for the Christian's loving and filial trust in God.

In the epistle to the Hebrews it is taught in reference to God that he exists and that he is the only living God (iii. 12; x. 31; xi. 6), and that he possesses supreme majesty, and is omniscient, immutable and holy (i. 3; iv. 13; vi. 17, 18; xii. 14). He is the creator of the universe, and also sustains special relations to such as seek him and submit to him (iii. 4; xi. 3, 6; xii. 5–10). While a Fatherhood is

attributed to God it is more than a Fatherhood of origination and is not unlimited (xii. 8, 9). The love of God is universal, for he has graciously arranged the death of Christ in behalf of every man, and holds out hope of forgiveness (ii. 9; viii. 12), but on the other hand his wrath is already displayed against the disobedient, and toward all that is unholy he is no less terrible than a consuming fire (iii. 11; iv. 3; x. 30, 31; xii. 29).

The conceptions of God which we find in the writings of John are chiefly dynamic and ethical. Although he mentions the invisibility of God, his omniscience, and his eternity (Jn. i. 18; I. Jn. iii. 20; Rev. i. 4, 8; iv. 8, 10; xv. 7; xxi. 6), we find no teaching of his unity (unless I. Jn. v. 20, 21 is an exception), his immutability or his omnipotence, and even his spirituality, of which he records Christ's statement, is not again alluded to by John. Creation finds mere mention, and in the Revelation that occurs only in ascriptions of praise (Jn. i. 3, 10; Rev. iii. 14; iv. 11; x. 6). All the

thought of John respecting God seems to sum itself up in three words. First in his mind, God is life. We lack a statement of this conception as tersely made as are its parallels, but it is repeatedly implied in declarations that God is the peculiar possessor and sole source of life (Jn. i. 4; v. 26; I. Jn. v. 11, 20; Rev. iv. 9, 10; vii. 2; x. 6; xv. 7). This conception unifies the whole relation of God to the world and at the same time transforms it, so that it is in no sense an external or mechanical relation, but by it God is made the constant secret and source of all real enjoyment and power — for to John the spiritual alone deserves the name of the real.

But God who is life is also light (I. Jn. i. 5). The context shows that this statement, doubled as it is in the manner so characteristic of John, is intended, first and foremost, as an assertion of God's holiness, which is absolute, untarnished by admixture of any imaginable element of evil, and the figurative form in which it is cast gives to the expression increased force. The same

figure is employed in his Gospel (i. 4, 9) to suggest another element in the apostle's idea of God, namely, that his activity tends unceasingly to diffuse itself, if we may so speak, and to transform whatever it reaches. Though an intellectual element need not be excluded, this illuminating power is of course preëminently spiritual. That God is light can mean no less than this, that there is in every practicable way constant intensity of divine self-manifestation, and that wherever this self-manifestation reaches there is also power to which we can set no bounds.

But above all, God is love (I. Jn. iv. 8, 16). In this statement John summarizes and reaffirms all his declarations concerning the love of God (Jn. iii. 16; I. Jn. iii. 1; iv. 7, 9, 10, 16, 19, 21). Love is John's supreme word. While the favorite words of Paul, mercy and grace, describe the stream of divine benevolence as it reaches men, in some degree affected by the condition of its objects, love is John's one name for the same divine benevolence, as eternally

changeless in its outflowing from the nature of God as is that nature itself. This love is self-originated and independent of all return or response, and so it is universal, embracing all, even the sinful world. Of all conceivable attributes of God, love is the most central, essential and characteristic. It is said by the apostle that God is love (I. Jn. iv. 8, 16), as it could not be said that he is justice or anything else, even holiness. But we are not justified from this fact in going further and saying that God is love in such a way that his love ceases to be the constantly free determination of his will. It does not exalt God either metaphysically or ethically to assert that his character is due, not to the fact that he ceaselessly chooses and wills what is best, but to the iron fetters of his constitution, regardless of his will. If this were so, then man, when he gladly chooses love as the noblest thing in the world, were nobler and better than God himself. Of course it is correct to say that, "the position that God ever does or ever could cease to be generous, merci-

ful and loving is a perilous admission for theology, involving, as it does, the alternative that either naked justice alone is essential to moral perfection, or that God can be conceived as choosing to become something less than perfect,[1]" but it is no less true and no less pertinent to assert a similar alternative in reference to justice or holiness. We gain the richest, most consistent and most helpful conception of the divine character, and one at least in perfect harmony with the teachings of the New Testament, when we hold that he, the supreme ideal for his creatures who are made in his image, attains and retains virtue, even the chiefest virtue of love, by the persistent exercise of a free but invariably holy will. It is finally interesting to note that John, while making considerable use of the title "Father," usually employs it in very close relation with Christ, the "Son" (Jn. i. 14; I. Jn. i. 3; iv. 14). It is noteworthy that he who stood nearest to Jesus, and who in the spirit of his Master made very much of

[1] Professor G. B. Stevens, D.D., "Johannine Theology," p. 54.

God's love to the whole world, made of the particular phase of this love represented by Fatherhood almost the least proportionally of all the New Testament writers.

One phase of the New Testament teachings touching the nature of God seems to have such historical and dogmatic importance as to warrant and in some sense to require discussion by itself; namely, the three-foldness of the divine nature. We must again remind ourselves that with the artless style of the New Testament, and the constantly practical purpose of its authors, the metaphysical statements of the nineteenth century or of the fourth are not to be expected, while, on the other hand, the theological positions of the apostles may be recognized in the end quite as clearly in their unconscious expressions as they could have been in any intentionally formal declarations. It will be acknowledged by all that Jesus held and taught the doctrine of the unity of God, in fullest concord with the teachings of the Old Testament and the unanimous views of his

nation in that age as in all later ages. Now, while the statements of Jesus which imply his preëxistence and furnish more than suggestions of his own real divinity appear still more distinctly in the fourth Gospel than in the other three, yet even in the latter records the deity of Christ is actually involved in the demand for absolute spiritual devotion to himself, and is really implied in the relation which is taught of Father and Son, for this relation implies subordination in rank and no less equality of nature and likeness of essence, at least as employed with reference to Jesus. As to the Holy Spirit also we have teaching, especially in John's record though by no means exclusively there, that he too is personal, divine and subordinate (Matt. xii. 31, 32; Jn. xiv. 16, 17, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 13–15). The baptismal formula which Matthew records as given by Jesus after his resurrection is equally in harmony with the thought of Christ as elsewhere learned and with the belief of the primitive church even on its Jewish-Christian side. The opinion and doc-

trine of the Judean apostles is illustrated by the facts that each of the synoptic Gospels distinguishes and combines the activity of the divine Three at the Jordan side (Matt. iii. 16, 17; Mk. i. 10, 11; Lk. iii. 21, 22); and that — alike in the very earliest preaching and in later writings — Jesus is exalted to the very throne of God, the Spirit in turn comes from God, and individual activity of a personal sort is ascribed to both Son and Spirit (Acts ii. 32, 33; vii. 56; viii. 29, 39; xiii. 2; xv. 28; I. Pet. i. 12; Heb. i. 3; iii. 7); and that Father, Son and Spirit are combined in expressions which imply their equality of divine nature together with diversity of office (I. Pet. i. 1, 2; Jude 20, 21). The thought of Paul and John is still farther developed, as is indeed the case with almost every theological thought. As has already been noted, Paul ascribes to Christ the form of God and equality with him (Phil. ii. 6), and, indeed, gives him the very name, God (Rom. ix. 5; compare Tit. ii. 13), as well as the substantially divine titles of Lord and Son, and assigns to him the essen-

tially divine tasks of creating and upholding the world (Col. i. 16, 17). He likewise ascribes to the Spirit acts which are at once personal and divine (I. Cor. ii. 10–15; xii. 8–11; Rom. viii. 14, 16, 26, 27; Eph. ii. 21, 22; iv. 30), and repeatedly associates the Father, Son and Spirit in a manner which only trinitarian thought can fully explain (I. Cor. viii. 4–6; xii. 4–6; II. Cor. xiii. 14; Rom. viii. 9; xv. 30; Eph. ii. 18). The teaching of John is quite as clear and strong. His idea of the Logos is explicable only as a personal principle in the Godhead, equally divine with the Father and at the same time in some sense distinct from him. The Christology of the Revelation is quite as lofty in its conception of the nature of Christ as any part of the New Testament, a fact which becomes the more remarkable the earlier it is set and the more purely Jewish in origin and character it is held to be. In this book there is less mention of the Spirit, but he is clearly regarded as personal (Rev. xxii. 17) and is manifestly divine, so that it is not surprising to find what

is really a trinitarian formula (Rev. i. 4, 5), though it describes the persons instead of merely naming them. In conclusion it may be said that though the New Testament does not give trinitarian dogma, it must be held to give trinitarian thought, of which trinitarian dogma is only formal expression, and in fact the only correct and adequate expression.

CHAPTER VI

THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING MAN

THE New Testament teaching as to the nature, moral condition, and relations of man is practically little less important than its doctrine of God. But the authors never approach this subject as if intending to communicate fresh truth, hitherto unknown and unknowable, but as recognizing, confirming and applying facts generally accessible and already commonly comprehended. Nor is there any substantial diversity in the way that the different authors approach and apply these facts. Accordingly, in the treatment of this topic, it is less necessary than elsewhere to distinguish the particular contributions of the different authors and schools of thought, for there is no progressiveness of revelation or development of doctrine, but only more or less of clearness

in the recognition of truth, or fullness in the statement of it, or force in the application of it. Nothing, however, would be gained by modifying the usual order and method.

The teaching of Jesus according to the synoptic reports recognizes both the elements which consciousness invariably testifies to as constituting human nature (Matt. x. 28). Both flesh and body are words used to designate the material element; one of these terms giving prominence to the substance, the other to the organism wrought out of that substance. Jesus also used the words, spirit and soul, in a way somewhat parallel to flesh and body, in so far at least as spirit and flesh are correlative terms, and soul and body. It is not safe, however, to infer that soul and spirit sustain the same relation to each other as do body and flesh, for, while spirit may in some cases designate the substance, so to speak, and soul the organism, yet Jesus uses the word, spirit, in a way that transcends this limitation (Lk. xxiii. 46; xxiv. 39). He also uses the familiar metonymy by

which flesh, or flesh and blood, is employed for man, of whose nature it forms such a conspicuous part (Matt. xvi. 17; xxiv. 22). That man is mortal is constantly recognized by Jesus, but he no less gives us to understand that death does not end all, being merely the separation of soul and body. Though the body suffers dissolution, the soul continues conscious existence until that reunion of body and soul which is styled resurrection (Matt. x. 28; Lk. xvi. 22, 23, 25; xx. 35, 36; xxiii. 43). Man is, in comparison with nature and in the sight of God, of great value (Matt. x. 31; xvi. 26; xviii. 14). Before him stretches out a great range of possibilities, blessed and otherwise (Matt. x. 28, 39; Mk. ix. 42–48). Men are warned of the imminent and terrible danger of ruin and destruction, which, however, cannot be annihilation, as that is a conception wholly foreign to the New Testament as also to the general thought of the Jews of Christ's time.

The Johannine record gives essentially the same impression as to the teaching of Jesus

about the nature of man. The possession of flesh and spirit or soul by men, and by himself as a man, is presupposed, as becomes doubly sure when, as so often occurs, it is made the basis of figurative language (iii. 6; vi. 51–56; xii. 27). Of death and future existence less is said than in the earlier Gospels, but mortality is taken for granted, and death, like life, is made, by a figurative extension of meaning, to become the vehicle of purely spiritual concepts (viii. 51; xi. 25, 26); while the declaration of a future general resurrection is even more unmistakably made, and with more than a suggestion of a future blissful or woeful existence into which it ushers men (v. 28, 29).

The teaching of Peter and of the other apostles who are to be grouped with him, confirms most of the facts already noted. That man is constituted of flesh and spirit (I. Pet. ii. 11; iii. 18; iv. 6), that he will die, and that in spite of death he will continue to exist (Acts ii. 27, 29, 31; James ii. 26; iv. 13–15; I. Pet. iii. 19): all these truths find their place in the

course of apostolic thought. The declaration in regard to the nature of man which is of chief interest is perhaps the assertion of James (iii. 9) that man was made in the image of God, a statement which has but a single parallel in the New Testament (I. Cor. xi. 7).

The anthropology of Paul is much fuller than that of any of his fellow apostles, and has been the starting point for great controversies and misunderstandings. Two questions especially demand answer: first, what did Paul teach as to the number of distinct elements in the constitution of man, and, second, what did he hold as to the nature and character of these elements. Once (I. Th. v. 23) Paul made a threefold enumeration of elements or aspects of human nature, but it is of course possible that this enumeration is rhetorical rather than scientific. The choice between these alternatives must be decided by the apostle's usage elsewhere, and he never again repeats the phrase or its equivalent. On the contrary he repeatedly sets body, or flesh, and spirit over against

each other in apparently exhaustive antithesis (I. Cor. v. 5; vi. 16, 17, 20; vii. 34; Rom. i. 3, 4; Eph. iv. 4; II. Cor. iv. 16). There is accordingly no sufficient reason to hold that Paul taught a threefold constitution of human nature.

When the flesh is set by Paul in contrast with the spirit, it is in most cases manifestly used not in its primary signification, but in a secondary sense; and also in a somewhat similar fashion the soul is contrasted with the spirit, or rather the psychical with the pneumatic (I. Cor. ii. 14; iii. 1, 3; xv. 44–46; Rom. vii. 14; viii. 4–10). While the original idea of flesh was of course that of material substance of the body (I. Cor. xv. 39; Col. i. 22), yet Paul found the significance of the word already extended to cover alike the individual man and the race, man as living his present life, as standing in family and social relations, and as characterized by human weakness (I. Cor. i. 26, 29; vi. 16; II. Cor. x. 4; Rom. i. 3; iii. 20; iv. 1; vi. 19; viii. 3; Gal. i. 16; Phil. i. 22). The further

extension of its signification to denote that which is sinful, or at least that which makes for sin, is probably due to the apostle himself, but it is in no way unnatural, and need be in no way confusing. That in man which is, as all would agree, the less noble factor of his being, that which is necessarily related to the sensuous and which becomes too often the tool of the sensual, that part of human nature in which evil finds, if not its original or most secure and final, at any rate its most manifest and frequent intrenchment, — this, the flesh, comes by a natural metonymy to signify what is base as well as low; what is not only contrasted with the loftier and better in man but also opposed to it. The contrast between the psychical and the pneumatic, which Paul draws less frequently, to be sure, but clearly, is to be explained in a similar way. The soul, as ordinarily spoken of, signifies that in man which is the seat of individual life, so that the word included in its Biblical usage more or less completely the ideas conveyed by our two words, soul and life (Mk.

viii. 35–37). But mere vitality is shared with the lower animals, and thus the psychical[1] came, at least in contrast with the pneumatic, to signify such aspects and activities of the inner man as relate especially to the present and outward life. The pneuma, or spirit, not only by contrast with that which was psychical but possibly also from the fact that pneuma had become the name of the divine Spirit, came to designate the loftiest aspects and activities of human nature; the pure, the religious, the Godward. While, according to Paul, only Christians are truly spiritual (I. Cor. ii. 14, 15), it does not follow that the spirit or pneuma is a faculty or set of faculties which are possessed by Christians alone. The consequences of this theory are so momentous as to require unmistakably clear and positive teaching before it should be accepted. Such teaching is lacking. On the contrary all men are addressed as if

[1] The word, natural, is a most misleading rendering for Paul's word, psychical. No ordinary meaning of the word, natural, corresponds at all to the idea of Paul.

capable of spiritual activity (Acts xvii. 30; xx. 26, 27; Rom. ii. 4; Col. i. 28); and Christians themselves are to be regarded as spiritual only when they live lives that are dominated by Godward impulses and controlled by the Holy Spirit (I. Cor. iii. 3; Gal. v. 16). The difference, then, between Christians and others does not lie in the possession by the former of faculties not possessed by the latter. The difference is uniformly regarded as not psychological but moral, an unlikeness not of constitution but of character.

Paul uses two other words of less doctrinal importance to designate the immaterial part of man's nature; namely, mind and heart. The word translated "mind" is used in a way in which we do not use our corresponding word, being applied especially to the faculty of moral judgment (I. Cor. ii. 16; Rom. i. 28; vii. 23). Paul's use of the word "heart" cannot be said to differ from the ordinary use in Scripture (Matt. v. 8; xxii. 37; Lk. ii. 19, 51). It signifies the whole sphere and power of man's inner life, and with

Paul, as elsewhere, it never designates after the modern fashion the affections in particular. If its meaning is in any way limited, the especial reference is always to the intellectual, and not to the emotional part of the nature (Rom. i. 21; Eph. i. 18).

It is to be added that Paul takes for granted the mortality of man, and discusses only the relations of mortality to sin and the putting of an end to mortality as a factor in history and experience at the final triumph of Christ (Rom. v. 12; viii. 10, 11; I. Cor. xv. 26, 54–56). While Paul regarded death as an enemy, in some sense triumphing in the dissolution even of the Christian, and held that it brought about a temporary condition of disembodiment, he did not teach that it caused unconsciousness, but rather that it introduced into a blessed state of association with Christ (I. Cor. xv. 26, 54, 55; II. Cor. v. 2–4, 6; Phil. i. 22–24).

The writer to the Hebrews recognized as clearly as did Paul the two-fold constitution of man (ii. 14; ix. 13, 14; x. 22; xii. 9). The

expression "dividing of soul and spirit" (iv. 12) has often been mistaken as a confirmation of the theory of trichotomy, but study of the whole passage should convince that no other distinction is thought of than a distinction among faculties of the same sort: the dividing is not a separation but a penetration. In the mind of this author, too, man is mortal, judgment looms up for all after death (ii. 2, 3, 14; ix. 27, 28), and while the continuance of consciousness is never expressly asserted, the suggestion of it can scarcely be excluded (xii. 1, 23).

The apostle John makes but slight contributions to our stock of knowledge as to the nature of man, reserving his interest for the discussion of character. Of body he does not speak at all, except in historical allusions to the body of Christ, nor does he speak of soul as an element of human nature. With him, as with Paul, flesh signifies by figurative extension all of human nature (Jn. i. 14; I. Jn. iv. 3), but that he puts upon flesh no stamp as being essentially evil is

manifest from the fact that, in both the passages just referred to, he is speaking of Christ. Of mortality and of the nature of death there is really no discussion; but in the Revelation, in particular, we find that after death — but, so far as notes of time can be traced, before the resurrection — believers are represented as active, praying and praising (vi. 10; xiv. 2, 3; xv. 2–4).

The teachings of the New Testament as to the character of man occupy a much larger and more significant place than the teachings as to his constitution, but there is, if possible, even less variation of view and statement among the different authors. The fact of universal human sinfulness is everywhere thrown into the foreground. John the Baptist began his work with a trumpet call to repentance, and sealed it by the introduction of baptism, which, whatever else it may have signified, must at any rate have been recognized to have a relation to the remission of sins (Matt. iii. 2, 14; Mk. i. 4; Lk. iii. 3). Those who approached John with no confession or sense of sin or of the need of

its remission, were for that very reason the more sternly charged with the sinfulness which they ignored (Matt. iii. 7, 8; Lk. iii. 7, 8).

The public preaching of Jesus began with the same demand upon all his hearers for repentance (Matt. iv. 17), which demand necessarily carried with it the same implication of sinfulness. Jesus takes for granted the evil state of even his disciples (Matt. vii. 11); as, for forgiveness of sins, even disciples are regularly and permanently to pray (Matt. vi. 12; Mk. xi. 25; Lk. xi. 4). The rejection and crucifixion of himself is regarded as extremely sinful but as in no way abnormal; rather are those who do this the typical men (Matt. xvii. 22). Only by repentance can doom be averted from any (Lk. xiii. 3, 5), and except on condition of complete transformation none can enter the heavenly kingdom (Matt. xviii. 3). Though surrounded by influences evil and hostile, man retains his power of choice and consequent responsibility. While to be sure this is never explicitly asserted because never questioned, this fact is in

reality implied in every injunction and every warning. While thus insisting on the sinfulness of man and his need of repentance, Jesus does not fail, on the other hand, to recognize every element of good which finds a place in heart and in life. The performance of moral duties (Mk. x. 20, 21); even compliance with the ritual law (Matt. xxiii. 23); neighborly service of helpfulness according to need (Lk. x. 29–37); truly childlike trustfulness (Mk. x. 14), — all these in turn receive from Jesus due recognition. So too there is no less clear recognition of the varied degrees and manifestations of sinfulness. Not only act but also speech and even thought may be sinful (Matt. v. 22, 28; xii. 36); omitted good will be reckoned as committed sin (Matt. vii. 21; xxv. 45, 46); and every man stands under an immeasurable load of indebtedness to God (Matt. xviii. 23–35). While all sin is condemned and threatened with judgment and penal consequences (Mk. ix. 42-49; Lk. xii. 47, 48), one sin, public and shameless defying and maligning of the Holy Spirit, is put by Jesus

himself, not arbitrarily but, as we must think, because of its nature and necessary relations, beyond the pale of forgiveness forever (Matt. xii. 31, 32; Mk. iii. 29; Lk. xii. 10). While this sin alone is by its very nature past hope, yet there are only two distinct classes of men, their real condition being determined not by outward condition but by inward character (Matt. vi. 22–24; vii. 17, 18; Mk. vii. 20–23; Lk. vi. 43–45). The present moral condition of individuals may, however, be generally known from their behavior (Matt. vii. 16, 20, 22, 23), and it will be manifested finally, with the most strict regard for all degrees of guilt, in the great separation of all evildoers to permanent penal suffering (Matt. v. 29, 30; xiii. 38–43, 49, 50; xxiv. 48–51; xxv. 30, 46; Mk. ix. 42–49; Lk. xii. 45–48; xiii. 24–30). Along with the teaching of the responsibility of man for his sin, Jesus also recognized the possibility of amendment at the present time. His adoption of the comfortable prophecy of Isaiah as the keynote of his ministry (Is. lxi. 1, 2; Lk. iv. 17–21);

his very injunction to strenuous endeavor to enter the narrow gate (Matt. vii. 13); his many parables of welcome for the wayward and lost; his approval of the paralytic, of Zaccheus, of the penitent publicans and harlots (Matt. ix. 2; Lk. xix. 5, 9, 10; Matt. xxi. 31, 32); his grief over the failure of the people of Jerusalem to heed his warnings (Matt. xxiii. 37; Lk. xiii. 34); these and still other facts of his ministry bring continually fresh confirmations of his teaching that salvation is possible as well as needful for men.

The teaching of Jesus in the report of John is less full on many of the points just noted, but when we have the record of his words they seem even more positive and decisive. The universality of sin is nowhere the theme of particular discussion, but it could scarcely be taught more clearly in any way than in the declaration to Nicodemus of the necessity for complete transformation on the part of every one who will share in the blessings which Christ brings (iii. 3, 5). As elsewhere it is

implied that men are fully responsible for their character and conduct, and while, from the controversial nature of the discourses which find record in the fourth Gospel, there is less of formal recognition of goodness in character and action, they contain even more decided teaching as to the varied manifestations and degrees of sinfulness (ix. 41; xv. 22, 24; xix. 11). The possibility of amendment is fully recognized, and where it is found to be lacking, the failure is explained as due to the persistent willfulness of the man himself (v. 40). The indispensableness of regeneration (iii. 3, 5), and of a divine drawing (vi. 44, 45), is due not to a defect of freedom but to a misuse of it, not to weakness but to willfulness.

The speeches of Peter in Acts say much of the sinfulness of the Jews as it was most markedly shown in the judicial murder of Jesus (iii. 14; v. 30), although it is recognized that the sinfulness of this crime was in some measure relieved by their blindness to his true position (iii. 17). Every one has iniquities to be blotted

out (iii. 26), but the often repeated injunction to repent is itself significant of freewill, responsibility and the possibility of betterment. In the epistles of Peter sin of the grossest type is regarded as a fact of common life, of the life even of those whom he addressed (I. Pet. iv. 3), and all are supposed to be aware that corruption is in the world by desire (II. Pet. i. 4). James gives no space to proving the facts as to sin, but puts the thought of it in new relations. Against the self-righteous he emphasizes the unity of the law of God, and that any and every violation of the law constitutes the man a sinner (ii. 9–11), and also he warns strongly against sins of omission (iv. 17). Temptation he teaches to reside, in the deepest analysis, only in the evil of the man's own nature, and sin to be the result of his own choice (i. 13–15).

That all men are sinners is demonstrated at length by Paul to the Romans as the introduction to his discussion and justification of the divine method of salvation (Rom. i. 18–iii. 20). He first draws a picture of the heathen world,

horrible, yet demonstrably true to the facts of the age; then charges the moralist and in particular the Pharisaical Jew with inconsistency in that he is guilty of acts which are sins, and essentially the same sins which he rebukes in others; and ends with quotations from the Old Testament which assert universal sinfulness, although this was a fact which then, as now, would need for the thoughtful only rhetorical confirmation, not logical demonstration. This truth is in no way nullified by the distinction which he later (Rom. v. 13, 14) draws between sin and transgression, inasmuch as this distinction does not pertain to the character of an act but to its relation to law. In the same passage Paul gives some clue to his ideas as to the beginning of sin in the world. He accepts the story of Genesis,[1] but under this form he conveys thoughts which penetrate far deeper into essential moral relations, and at the same time more certainly compel assent, than the notions which are sometimes drawn from the Penta-

[1] Compare I. Tim. ii. 13, 14.

teuchal narratives. The basis common to both ruin and redemption Paul finds to be the unity of the human race and the representative relation of one man. The sin of one man, the first man, the common ancestor of all the race, brought in moral depravation, which is entailed upon the whole race by natural descent and inheritance (it would be called heredity today), while the same race unity equally permits and enables one man, Jesus, to provide redemption for the whole race which he represents.

The moral freedom of man was clearly held by Paul, and none the less positively and tenaciously because of certain other views which he held but which seem to some to be inconsistent therewith. Paul declares and emphasizes a divine election and effectual call of individuals to personal salvation (I. Th. i. 4; I. Cor. i. 9, 28–30; Rom. viii. 28–30; ix.–xi.), but he is nowhere guilty of the folly of disputing or ignoring the fact of human freedom. While he teaches that the supreme purpose of God is sure of fulfillment (Phil. i. 6; Rom. viii. 33),

he yet includes the will of man as one of the factors and forces through the coöperation of which the eternal purpose reaches its accomplishment (Phil. ii. 12, 13; I. Cor. xv. 2; Gal. v. 25; Rom. viii. 14, 28; xi. 14, 23). Whatever difficulties Paul may have felt in the relation of man's freedom and God's purpose, they could certainly have been no more than every thinker feels whenever the finite and the infinite are brought together, and he never sought to evade the difficulties by denying or ignoring either of the factors of the problem. Paul believed profoundly and intensely in man's freedom and consequent responsibility with its inevitable results, the possibility of amendment and the possibility of persistence in evil to the point of utter ruin. This condition of ruin he often calls death, including under that name not merely or, indeed, chiefly physical death, but rather the final and total failure of the whole man to attain the true ends of his existence (Gal. vi. 8; Rom. ii. 4–10; vi. 21, 23; viii. 6; Phil. iii. 19). It does not appear that Paul distinguished the

conceptions of death in its various aspects, physical, spiritual, eternal, as sharply and separated these notions as completely as many have done. Rather he looked upon them as the result of sin and so unified them and held them associated in his thinking, although one or another of these various aspects might at any time be the special theme of discussion.

The teaching of the epistle to the Hebrews, while in tone and manner quite independent, is confirmatory, so far as it goes, of the views already stated. Sinfulness is presupposed (ii. 17; iv. 15; viii. 12); freedom is taken for granted; but assurance of final salvation rests after all not in man but in God (vi. 10–20; viii. 10–12; x. 26); and while reformation is enjoined and hoped for, there remains a tremendous possibility that misdoing will finally result in irreparable ruin (vi. 4–8; x. 26–31, 39: xii. 15–17).

The thought of John as to the character of man is very closely akin to the teaching which he reports from his Master. While the Apoc-

alypse depicts the great activity and results of sin, John's doctrinal teaching is of course mainly found in his first epistle. Here (i. 8–10) the sinfulness of man and the universality of this sinfulness is asserted with greater definiteness and force, if possible, than anywhere else in the whole New Testament. In his thought the indefinite variation and gradation of sinfulness among men seem almost to sink out of sight, and all men simply fall into the two great classes, "the children of God," and "the children of the devil" (I. Jn. iii. 10). Against the false doctrine of the day which obscured and even denied moral distinctions, this apostle puts forth as the decisive test of rightness in the right life, that one should act rightly (I. Jn. i. 6, 7; ii. 3–6; iii. 7–10; III. Jn. 11). Only the righteous in behavior is right. The good man keeps the commandments. Sin is in its essence nullification of law (I. Jn. iii. 4). Temptation is nowhere alluded to; progress in good or evil is ignored; moral transformation, or conversion, is only once (I. Jn. v. 16, 17) mentioned

as a possibility; freedom is nowhere emphasized, even in injunctions to right action, inasmuch as behavior gains its greatest importance from the fact that it is regarded, not as a means of becoming, but as a sign of being; and character is thought of as having already resulted in a condition preëminently spiritual in its nature, either light or darkness, either life or death (I. Jn. ii. 9, 10; v. 12, 16).

That men do not stand alone in the universe, but that it contains other moral beings to whom they are or may be related is a fact clearly recognized in the synoptic teaching of Jesus. Some of these beings are holy in character and usually bear the name of angels. They are above the social limitations of earth; are continually in the presence of God; will be associated with the Son at his royal return; stand ready, if possible, to aid the Redeemer in his earthly work, respecting which they possess great knowledge; and are prompt at all times to serve the members of Christ's kingdom (Matt. xiii. 39, 41; xviii. 10; xxii. 30; xxiv. 36; xxv.

31 ; xxvi. 53 ; Mk. viii. 38 ; Lk. xii. 8, 9 ; xvi. 22). Contrasted with these holy angels stand the angels of the devil, unclean spirits, or demons [1] (Matt. xxv. 41 ; Lk. xi. 24 ; xiii. 32), which in various ways exercise an influence over men, not fully defined but clearly malign and to be dreaded. It cannot fairly be said that the teaching of Christ on the subject of angels, good and bad, is merely an accommodation to the notions of his hearers with no endorsement of them ; the extent of this teaching is too great and its tone too positive to allow such a view reasonably to be held. At the head of the demons is the chief spirit of evil, variously styled Satan, the Devil, and Beelzebub (Matt. xii. 26, 27 ; xiii. 39 ; xxv. 41 ; Mk. iii. 26). The fullest discussion in regard to any single activity of Satan is the narrative of the temptation of Jesus (Matt. iv. 1–11 ;

[1] It is a serious defect in the Canterbury revision that, by failing to correct, it perpetuates the error of using the name "devils" for the beings called in the New Testament "demons."

Mk. i. 12, 13; Lk. iv. 1–13), which, though recorded by the evangelist in the third person, is necessarily autobiographical on the part of Jesus in its origin. In this narrative Satan is represented as tempting Jesus, and the typical character of this fact is suggested in the petition of the Model Prayer for deliverance from the evil one (Matt. vi. 13). The hostility of Satan to souls is again shown in the warning to Peter shortly before his denial (Lk. xxii. 31). The parables of the sower and of the tares bring out his hostility respectively to the truth and to the interests of the kingdom (Lk. viii. 12; Matt. xiii. 39). The success of the apostles means his downfall, and his end will be complete ruin (Lk. x. 18; Matt. xxv. 41).

The relation of human sin to evil in other realms and to other evil beings is still more clearly indicated in the Gospel of John than in the synoptic reports, and thus the division of men into two and but two great classes is made, if possible, still more pronounced. Men are either the children of God or the children of the devil,

a being whose character is essentially and only evil (viii. 42, 44), whose power on earth is such that he may fitly be called "the prince of this world," but whose power was broken in his failure to overcome Jesus (xii. 31 ; xiv. 30 ; xvi. 11).

There is in the synoptic Gospels, apart from the words of Jesus, considerable matter intimating or illustrating the existence and activity of evil spirits, since all the language in these books which relates to demons tends to confirm the view which has been taken of the doctrine of Jesus. Peter, as reported in Acts (v. 3), refers to the influence of Satan in perverting to evil, and in the letters of himself and those most closely associated with him, the existence, character and activity of angels and of Satan are presupposed in such a way that readers are not taught these facts as previously unknown, but are only reminded of them, that they may put this knowledge to more effective use (I. Pet. v. 8, 9 ; II. Pet. ii. 4 ; James iv. 7 ; Jude 9).

The language of Paul makes it abundantly clear that he holds the same views as other

authors of Scripture concerning the relation of men to other moral beings. Indeed more than any other writer he gives specific details regarding the unseen kingdoms which surround us, the spiritual powers in the heavenly realms. While the epistle to the Colossians is, from the nature of the errors which the apostle is combating, peculiarly rich on this subject, it is to be noted that in his earlier letters, as well, much is made of angels. For example, he writes to the Corinthians that not only his apostolic ministry but even their little church gatherings are a spectacle to the angels, who further in some unexplained way are to be judged by Christians (I. Cor. iv. 9; vi. 3; xi. 10). From Paul's pen the words, authority, dominion, principality, and power,[1] usually refer to superhuman forces (I. Cor. xv. 24; Rom. viii. 38; Col. i. 16; ii. 10, 15; Eph. i. 21; vi. 12). These forces are

[1] It is an interesting question not yet finally settled whether "elements" (Gal. iv. 9; Col. ii. 8) may not have a similar reference. See Journal of Bibl. Lit., xv. (1896), pp. 183–192, and O. Everling, Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie, pp. 65–74, 100, 101.

of course thought of as personal and often, though not always, as evil. So far as they are evil they are regarded as subject to the prince of the power of the air (Eph. ii. 2), who, when thought of as himself the adversary of souls, is called Satan, or the devil, and is said to hinder, to tempt, to gain advantage over Christians (I. Th. ii. 18; I. Cor. vii. 5; II. Cor. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 11). Once, at least (Col. i. 20), the apostle gives a hint of a possible extension of redemption through Christ in some way beyond earth into the angelic abodes. Paul connects the condition of men, not only with the angelic hosts, as has just been seen, but also with the present state of the world (Rom. viii. 19–22), briefly suggesting as the solution of the whole problem of suffering in the world at large, that it is due to the sinful state of humanity. The writer to the Hebrews simply reminds his readers of the fact that men are related both to good angels and to the devil (i. 14; ii. 14).

John in his epistle repeats with added distinctness the contrast which he has recorded in

his Gospel from the lips of Jesus between the children of God and the children of the devil (I. Jn. iii. 8, 10), and the same evil being is made by him to be the sphere and source of power of the whole world out of Christ (v. 19). In the Revelation the influence and hostility of Satan is mentioned in four of the seven letters to the churches (ii. 10, 13, 24; iii. 9). It is hardly necessary to say that throughout the Revelation angels play an important part, and, not as a figure but as the explanation of a figure, the victory of Christ and Christians is called a victory over the being "that is called the devil and Satan, that leads astray the whole habitable world" (xii. 9–11; xx. 2).

CHAPTER VII

THE NATURE OF SALVATION

THE thought of man's condition as a sinner naturally leads next to the consideration of the nature of the salvation which is promised in the New Testament; for that the idea of a gospel, good news, a message of salvation from God through Christ, pervades from beginning to end the book which we are studying, will be disputed by no one and so requires no demonstration.

The form first chosen by Jesus in which to set forth in his public addresses the blessings which he would secure to men, was to call them the coming of the kingdom. By the use of this phrase he took advantage of the expectations which had been excited by Old Testament prophecy, cherished with ever increasing ardor by the Jewish people amid centuries of misfor-

tune and oppression, and at last fanned to a flame by the preaching of John the Baptist, the substance of whose message was "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." While we recognize that Jesus thus appropriated language made familiar by the previous use of others, it is not necessary to hold that his own ideas, even at the beginning of his ministry, at the time of the adoption of the phrase, were limited to the notions which others attached to it, or that they were in entire agreement with them. No phrase could be found already in use which would convey fully his own conception of his mission and its result, while any absolutely new expression would be necessarily at first meaningless or misleading. The phrase chosen was in its essential signification correct, and was helpfully related to ancient prophecy. The fact that his countrymen had missed in part, in part perverted its true meaning was no sufficient reason why he should avoid it; rather it was a reason why he should adopt it, transform it and redeem it. Accordingly his Galilean ministry, to which the

synoptic Gospels to a great extent limit themselves, began with the repetition and reënforcement of the proclamation of his forerunner "The kingdom of God is at hand" (Mk. i. 14, 15), and this became what we might call the keynote of that whole part of his work. Some may object to this justification of his adoption of the phrase that, except in the fundamental signification, there was really no agreement between the notions attached to the phrase in the mind of Jesus and in the minds of the people, while in all development and extension his thought was entirely unlike theirs. The further objection may be raised that according to their thinking the coming kingdom of the Messiah would bring peculiar opportunity and privilege to the Jewish nation, while to him such an idea was always foreign. But these objections rest upon a misconception, and are due to a failure to comprehend the true relations and significance of his earlier ministry and of his final claim of royalty and presentation of himself to the Jewish nation as their promised king. First and last his

ministry was a national ministry, and if it was not so throughout this was due to the hostility of the nation, which had frustrated his endeavor and made necessary a transformation of his methods. He did not turn to the work with individuals as individuals, and especially to the task of convincing, confirming and training the Twelve, which later occupied his energies and characterized his later ministry, until the constantly increasing opposition and practical rejection on the part of the national authorities absolutely required this new method. We have the further significant facts of his tears over the capital (Matt. xxiii. 37–39; Lk. xiii. 34, 35; xix. 41–44); of his foretelling the transfer of the kingdom from the Jews (Matt. xxi. 43); and of his final entry into Jerusalem in a manner strikingly suggestive of the familiar prophecies relating to the coming king (Zech. ix. 9; Matt. xxi. 1–9; Mk. xi. 9, 10). From these facts it may be not unreasonably inferred that it was his actual intention to offer the kingdom in some peculiar sense to the

Jewish nation. Had that nation received instead of rejecting him and the expected kingdom with him, this kingdom might in the providence of God have received such a form that without forfeiting its universality or its spirituality the Jews would yet have been given a place in it which would have fulfilled the ancient prophecies, although the manner of such fulfillment may now be as incomprehensible as actual fulfillment is and must now forever remain impossible.

However this may have been, the kingdom as proclaimed by Jesus certainly differed greatly from the national ideals of the time. The name or names which he used should have been suggestive and instructive. Though perhaps neither of them was original with him, both, as he used them, were full of meaning. Some have asserted that Jesus could not himself have used the name "kingdom of heaven." This has been explained as the outgrowth of Jewish superstition avoiding the name of the deity, and it has also been said that, after the destruc-

tion of Jerusalem proved the impossibility of the earthly kingdom which had been promised, a new turn was given to the doctrine of the kingdom by the introduction into its name of the word, heaven. But these assertions are destitute at once of proof and of probability. There is no sufficient reason to doubt that both names, "kingdom of heaven" and "kingdom of God," were really employed by Jesus in his teachings to set forth the blessings which he offered to men. By the name, heaven, he stamped the kingdom as something not worldly but otherworldly in character, in no sense directly political but purely spiritual, and better than the best of earth. By calling it the kingdom of God he taught that the central force and controlling power is divine.

The word, kingdom, may have various meanings and applications and is actually employed by Christ in a variety of senses and relations. It may be either abstract or concrete; that is, it may signify either the dominion and rule itself, or that which is subject to its sway; it

may be either the rule of God or the realm of God. In a few passages it is unmistakably abstract (Matt. vi. 33; Lk. xxii. 29; compare Matt. vi. 10). In a much greater number it is unmistakably concrete (Matt. xiii. 41; Mk. x. 23; Lk. vii. 28), and in many more it is ambiguous (Matt. ix. 35; xiii. 19). While the addition of "heaven" or "God" shows that it is spiritual in its character, the name, kingdom, itself, at least in its concrete use, implies that it pertains to more than a single individual, for, though an individual may seek to rule or submit to rule, one alone cannot constitute a kingdom in the sense of a realm. In accordance with this suggestion of its name, the kingdom is often discussed by Jesus in its social aspects, as including and constituted of all who submit to the heavenly and divine dominion. Thus, the parables of the tares and the net (Matt. xiii. 24–30, 37–43, 47–50) plainly have to do with the community of those who, outwardly at least, are submissive to the divine rule. This is in fact the name that Jesus commonly used in reference

to the community which his followers should later constitute, for only twice (Matt. xvi. 18; xviii. 17) is the name, church, employed by Jesus himself. The kingdom may then be regarded as abstract or as concrete, as individual and spiritual or as collective and social, and so it may be further thought of as subjective or as objective; that is, it may be regarded as the invisible inward possession of the individual (Matt. v. 3; xiii. 33; Mk. x. 15; xii. 34; Lk. vi. 20; xvii. 21), or as the external and tangible manifestation of the effects of the great spiritual idea possessed by and possessing many individuals. Again, Christ represents the kingdom, even outwardly, sometimes as present (Matt. xi. 11, 12; xii. 28; xxi. 31; Lk. xvii. 21), and sometimes as future (Matt. vi. 10; viii. 11; Mk. xiv. 25). This diversity of usage in the several parables which illustrate the growth of the kingdom is readily explained. Though only germinant it is still actually existent at the present time; it is also future because only in the future will it develop to its full and sure consummation.

As has already been noted, the doctrine of the kingdom of heaven and of God in its various aspects, as the reigning of God in a man and over men, and the state of things when God rules the heart and the world as he rules in heaven, this constitutes the most striking element in the preaching of Jesus. It is by no means, however, the whole of the gospel of Jesus even according to the synoptic reports. It should be noticed first that, in mentioning the particular blessings to be expected in relation to the kingdom, Jesus never specifies material blessings. Plenty, peace, long life, which were the blessings of the old covenant, play no part in the new dispensation. The farthest stretch in this direction is the assurance (Matt. vi. 32, 33; Lk. xii. 30, 31) that God knows that his children need food and raiment and that they may expect that these necessaries of life will be supplied. A conspicuous feature of his own ministry was his work of miraculously curing disease, but this has no place in relation to his teaching except in so far as it was one of

his credentials, and that faith was ordinarily required from the person who sought the blessing. It is on spiritual blessings that the emphasis of Jesus rested, and foremost of all on the remission of sins or their forgiveness. Even without waiting for formal request forgiveness is proclaimed to the paralytic and to the woman of the town whose tears of love declared her penitent faith (Mk. ii. 5; Lk. vii. 47), and the forgiving temper which is the especial condition of forgiveness receives frequent stress (Matt. vi. 12, 14, 15; xviii. 21–35; Mk. xi. 25; Lk. xi. 4). In its root meaning the word chosen to signify forgiveness is remission (Matt. xxvi. 28), but it is manifest that there is in the blessing a personal element which the word, remission, might obscure, and which it will not do to overlook. The forgiveness which God gives must be the same in kind as that which he demands as the condition of it, and the forgiveness which we are required to exercise is more than a mere refraining from exacting requital of what has

been suffered — it necessarily involves reconciliation. Such reconciliation on God's part toward us is forgiveness, perhaps the chief blessing which Jesus offers.

There are other blessings of which Jesus spoke clearly, if not often. Once only (Matt. xi. 28–30), but in words of such beauty and power that they are perhaps the most quoted and best loved of all the teachings found in Matthew, Mark and Luke, Christ offered rest to the laboring and the heavy laden. Again, in the Beatitudes (Matt. v. 1–10; Lk. vi. 20, 21) he promises to his disciples not only the especially Messianic blessings of the kingdom of God and the inheritance of "the land," but also comfort, satisfaction, mercy, the sight of God and the rank of sons. The last thought is not only repeated in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 45), and in the implications of the oft-repeated "your Father," but also finds a very emphatic use at the end of Christ's ministry (Lk. xx. 36). It is further to be noted that alongside the impressive warning that loss is to be

expected for the sake of the kingdom and the king (Matt. xix. 29 ; Mk. viii. 35), there is added clear promise of a full recompense, which of course is not to be interpreted in a materialistic fashion. In harmony with the rest of the teachings of Jesus and in view of the implications of the words themselves, this recompense must be spiritual in its nature. Upon eternal life as one of the chief hopes and privileges of Christ's own, the first three Gospels lay less stress than the last, but in them, too, it finds no unimportant place (Matt. vii. 14 ; xviii. 8 ; xix. 29 ; xxv. 46 ; Lk. xv. 32). Freedom is nowhere definitely mentioned, but it is suggested and may be said to be necessarily involved in the thought of ransom (Mk. x. 45). Once in words, the Johannine tone of which is in most noteworthy and instructive contrast to the greater part of the synoptic discourses (Matt. xi. 27 ; Lk. x. 22), Jesus held out the hope of knowing God as one of the privileges which he will impart to his own. There must finally be noticed the words "save" and "salvation," in the use of which, though

without specifying the particular evils from which men are rescued, Christ sums up his own conception of his mission to a world which is in every sense of the word a lost world (Lk. xix. 9, 10; xv. 1–32).

The teachings of Jesus in respect to the promised salvation, which we find in the record of John, are in form so different from the teachings in the synoptic Gospels which have just been considered, that it is very easy to exaggerate the differences and to overlook the essential unity. During the whole period between the conversation with Nicodemus and the defence before Pilate, we hear not a word in John of the kingdom, and if it were possible we hear even less than in the synoptics concerning temporal and material blessings. Salvation, though positively made a part of Christ's work (v. 34; x. 9: xii. 47), is seldom discussed. Remission and forgiveness are not promised at all, though what is very exactly their equivalent, namely, freedom from condemnation, is very emphatically offered (v. 24). As the possession of life is one of the

chief characteristics of Christ himself (v. 26; xiv. 6), so his mission is represented in John as being to impart life (x. 10; xvii. 2), and as a result of his work all who submit to his gracious influence and become related to him come in turn to possess life (vi. 40, 47, 54). Of course, in the consideration of this promise, it must be carefully borne in mind, that throughout the Scriptures mere existence never constitutes life, least of all the eternal life which is promised and imparted by Christ. Life is rather a particular form of existence, existence raised to its highest power, so to speak, existence made the best possible and filled with the richest possible, but never defined, for from its very nature eternal life is and with our present experience must remain undefinable. It may also be noted that the life that is promised is represented sometimes in one sense as a present blessing (v. 24), and sometimes in another as a future blessing (vi. 27; xi. 25). A thought already found in the synoptic teaching which is made still clearer and more forceful in the fourth

Gospel, is that of freedom (viii. 32–36). Along with these promises still others bring out other phases of salvation scarcely less important and attractive, as, for example, the abiding of the Father and the Son with the believer (xiv. 23), the answer to prayer (xv. 16), the gift of the Spirit (xiv. 16, 26) and the knowledge of God (xvii. 3). On the whole, however, it may be said that, as the thought of the kingdom, inwardly and outwardly, here and hereafter, is the controlling form of the presentation of the promised blessings in such discourses of Jesus as are reported in the synoptic Gospels, so the controlling form in the Johannine discourses is life, alike now and hereafter, always life eternal.

The idea of the kingdom held no prominent place in the preaching and thought of the early church. This fact, at first thought somewhat surprising in view of the manner in which the apostles had thought and spoken during the lifetime of Jesus, is explicable only on the ground that the phrase had served the purpose of its introduction, had been a husk to the pro-

founder and more spiritual conceptions which Christ had imparted, but that when these conceptions had taken their own independent root in the minds of men, the husk was naturally dropped, with no loss and no sense of loss, quite likely with no consciousness that anything had been dropped. Up to the very time of Christ's ascension the apostles are constantly talking of the kingdom, and that apparently with the most worldly and material views of its nature (Acts i. 6). Immediately after the Pentecostal dispensation of the Spirit a transformation, quite according to promise (Jn. xvi. 13), shows itself in their manner of speaking, indicative of a corresponding modification of their ideas and conceptions, while a corresponding change, equally in harmony with the promise of Jesus, shows itself on the part of unbelievers (Jn. xvi. 7–11).

The keynote of the preaching of Peter is salvation, which he looks at chiefly as the remission of sins. To be sure, he often uses the expressions, salvation, and, being saved, without

any accompanying definition, presupposing a common understanding on the part of both speaker and hearers (Acts ii. 21, 40; iv. 12; xi. 14; xv. 11), and in this vague manner of presentation he is in harmony with the preaching of both Paul and the anti-Pauline faction (Acts xiii. 26, 47; xv. 1). But whenever Peter defines salvation, it is always as the forgiveness of sins, or perhaps better as the remission of them (Acts ii. 38; v. 31; x. 43). The word is the same as that used by Jesus himself to set forth the personal reconciliation with God in the forgiveness of sins, but, as the conception of Peter seems more objective and less personal, as he seems to be thinking of a condition rather than a relation between the soul and God, perhaps the change in translation from forgiveness to remission, though it falls rather in the realm of interpretation than of translation, may yet be advisable. At all events it was salvation in the sense of getting rid of the consequences of sin, which was the great possibility and hope that was held forth in the very earliest Chris-

tian preaching as it has been preserved to us in the book of Acts.

When Peter wrote, just as when he spoke, even though so long a time had intervened, salvation was still prominent in his mind. That salvation was the aspect under which the blessings received by Christians continued preëminently to be regarded, is confirmed to us by the title of Saviour, which began to be applied to Christ in the first Christian sermons (Acts v. 31), and is taken up again repeatedly in the letters of Peter, as it also occurs in the later epistles of Paul notably oftener than in his earlier writings. Peter mentions the kingdom but once (II. Pet. i. 11), this being the only time that we know of his speaking of it after the ascension of Christ, and it is here set in the future, — as, for that matter, salvation is represented in later writings more often as future than as past. Any specification which Peter gives as to the nature of salvation shows that he is thinking of it as salvation from sin, escape from its power, now, as not earlier, being

coupled with mere release from its consequences. It is declared that through Christ who suffered for sins the Christian already enjoys purifying, healing of soul, escape from pollution, redemption from the previous worthless manner of life, death to sin, — in short, all things that belong to "life and godliness" (I. Pet. i. 16; ii. 24; iii. 18; II. Pet. i. 3; ii. 20). Jude, though intending to write a letter which would fully develop the character of our common salvation, was prevented from doing so, and consequently we have on this subject nothing from his pen. James takes the word, save, as the simplest and, presumably, also as the most familiar expression for the work which Christ does in behalf of the believer (i. 21; ii. 14). Even in this most Judaic of the epistles we hear but a single echo (ii. 5) of the message of the kingdom. On the other hand James takes up and lays especial stress on the peculiarly Johannine ideas of liberty and life (i. 12, 25; ii. 12; v. 20), and the thought of pardon has lost none of its power (v. 15, 16, 20).

What the synoptic evangelists thought of the work of Christ seems to have found its most satisfactory expression in the characterization of the result for the believer as salvation. It is as Saviour that the name, Jesus, is interpreted in the record of Matthew (i. 21), and it is as salvation, here opposed to condemnation, that the great blessing conferred by Christ is described in the closing section of the Gospel of Mark[1] (xvi. 16).

In the course of his teaching as to the nature of Christ's blessings for those who accept him, Paul employs all the expressions which have been discussed and adds others to them. The sympathetic disciple who is his historian describes his preaching as a "preaching the kingdom of God" (Acts xxviii. 31). As Paul sets it forth, the kingdom is in various aspects both present and future (Col. i. 13; I. Cor. iv. 20; vi. 9, 10), both subjective and objective (Rom. xiv. 17; I. Cor. xv. 50). But while this

[1] Even if written some time after the Gospel itself, this section (xvi. 9–20) cannot reasonably be regarded as late.

thought must have received considerable emphasis in Paul's preaching, as appears from Luke's description of it, and as his letters additionally show, it is at the same time easy to see that it is not his favorite conception. The word, salvation, seems to satisfy him better, being found in some form of the word more than fifty times from the first to the last of his epistles (I. Th. v. 9; II. Tim. ii. 10). While the fact that salvation is a present possession is not overlooked (Rom. viii. 24), yet it is still more often conceived as future, just as the wrath from which we are saved and the kingdom to which we are saved find their consummation only in the future (Rom. v. 9; II. Tim. iv. 18). The ideas of life and liberty are also reasserted by Paul. Sometimes he speaks of life as transformed or renewed (II. Cor. v. 14, 15; Rom. vi. 4; Gal. ii. 19, 20), and sometimes as a condition which, whether present or future, is always in absolute contrast and opposition to the condition of the unsaved man (Rom. ii. 7; vi. 23; Gal. vi. 8; II. Tim. i. 10). Paul unifies

the thought of life in all its aspects, in a manner similar to the unification of all the aspects of death, which has already been noted. The eternal life is in some sense already entered on, and the life which now is only spiritual will some time affect the body, too (Rom. viii. 10, 11). Emancipation, of which also Paul speaks, is sometimes regarded as the special relation of freedom from the crushing burden of the Mosaic law, and sometimes as freedom from the dominion of sin as a principle which dominates the soul (Gal. v. 1, 13; Rom. vi. 15–22).

Beyond this circle of ideas in which Paul moves in company with his fellow apostles, he has another circle of ideas which, if not in their ultimate essence peculiar to himself, have at any rate been developed by him much farther than by any other. A conspicuous example of this class of ideas is his conception of justification or righteousness. The glimpses which he affords us into his early spiritual struggles (Rom. vii. 7–25; Gal. ii. 15–21; Phil. iii. 4–7) show conclusively that long before his conver-

sion he was profoundly impressed with the conviction that God could do nothing else than to visit "wrath and indignation, tribulation and distress on every soul of man that works evil" (Rom. ii. 8, 9). This conviction led him to his prolonged search for what he calls "righteousness," that is, the condition of those on whom God need not and will not visit the tribulation, distress and death which is the due consequence of sin. This condition, which all endeavors of his own had failed to attain, was reached at last as the first step in salvation, provided by God, supplied through Christ, received by faith (Phil. iii. 9), unearned, undeserved, freely given to the believing sinner. This condition he calls justification or righteousness.[1] Just what the righteousness is which the soul secures in Christ, just what it means to be righteous as Paul

[1] It is unfortunate that our language, unlike the Greek, must use words derived from two distinct roots to designate the act of justification and the consequent state of righteousness, and thus so often obscures the relations of the apostle's thought.

talked about it, has been and still is strenuously debated. Some have contended that the verb must mean to make right, and that justification is thus equivalent to securing betterment of character. Others have confined the meaning of the word solely to the declarative idea, making it equivalent to asserting the existence of goodness of character which might be asserted to exist even if as yet only germinant. But the form of the word, its usage both by Paul and elsewhere, and the course of his thought, bar out these meanings. While holding to the declarative force, we must recognize that it is not character but condition which is declared. The justified man is declared to be, not a perfect man in past time or at the present time, but one on whom God as judge will inflict no penalty for his sin. He is one who, though he is not without sin and is not declared by God to be without sin or regarded by God as being without sin, is yet treated by him as if without sin and is declared free from the penalty of sin (Rom. iii. 19–26; iv. 5, 6; v. 1, 2, 16; Acts

xiii. 39). Justification refers in Paul's teaching to relation and state. There is no fiction about it. It is the declaration of God that the believer will not be punished for his sin, even though he has been a sinner, and this is only another phase of forgiveness and is one of the indisputable and unassailable facts of the gospel. This view of the doctrine of Paul is confirmed not only by his setting condemnation over against righteousness (Rom. v. 18; viii. 1, 33, 34; II. Cor. iii. 9), but also by the other aspects of the same blessing which occasionally at least find clear statement, such as peace with God (Rom. v. 1; Col. i. 20) and the privilege of unhindered approach to God (Eph. iii. 12). A still closer parallel to this doctrine, and consequently a stronger confirmation of this view, is Paul's doctrine of the atonement, perhaps better named, at any rate for the purposes of New Testament Theology, the doctrine of reconciliation (II. Cor. v. 18, 19; Rom. v. 10, 11; Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 20–22). From the most probable meaning of the words which are rendered

enmity and reconciliation; from the course of the argument, and from the related and parallel ideas, it appears that the divine enmity to which Christians had been exposed, as sinners, was the opposite not of loving sentiment but of favorable treatment, and that the removal of it, which constitutes reconciliation, is not making God to love the sinner, but enabling him to treat him with the favor which, except for his mercy, would reach only to the good to whom alone it belongs of right.

While, then, it must be held that in the gospel of Paul justification was not based upon personal goodness, either inherent or imparted, either present or future, and was not based in any sense on behavior or on character which would merit it, but was gratuitous on the single condition of faith, which though indispensable is in no sense meritorious; at the same time it is unfair to ignore, as has too often been done, the indissoluble relation which he insisted on as existing between justification and character. Though a man is not justified because he is good or is to

become good (Rom. iv. 4–6), yet to Paul's mind it was utterly inconceivable and impossible that a justified man should remain "ungodly"; should in the end be anything but a perfectly good man (Rom. iii. 31; vi. 14, 22; viii. 4, 29). Accordingly, the second element in the strictly Pauline analysis of salvation is sanctification (I Cor. i. 30). This is often thought of as if it never included any other idea than personal betterment, improvement of character, becoming good. But, alike the root signification of the word, the manner in which it is often used, and Paul's general representation of the Christian life as being such that as a matter of fact even saints do sin, all these show that betterment is only a derived and secondary meaning. The primary meaning would be far better expressed to-day by the word, consecration, if only it were remembered that throughout the New Testament consecration proceeds not from man but from God, being his setting us apart for service. It is a grave error to think that Christians may set themselves apart to the

service of God; a worse error that it is optional whether they shall devote themselves to this service; worse still, if possible, that there are degrees of consecration. The New Testament represents that God has set apart all Christians wholly to his service, and that the most which they can do and the least which they should do is loyally to recognize and conform to this purpose and claim of his. The next step in the thought of Paul is simple, and natural, not to say inevitable. What is consecrated must be fit (Rom. xii. 1). When God consecrates, that is, sets apart intelligent moral beings to his service, character should correspond to function. God's own are to be godly (I. Cor. iii. 17; Eph. i. 4; v. 3, 27; Col. i. 22). From the conception of separation to service (I. Cor. i. 2; vi. 11) to that of becoming pure and holy to be fit for such service, and thence to the thought of holiness without immediate regard to service, the progress is easy and natural (I Th. iv. 4; II. Th. ii. 13; II. Cor. vii. 1; Rom. vi. 19, 22; Eph. iv. 24; I. Tim. ii. 15). This thought of

purified character, which may belong to sanctification or holiness, Paul often expresses in another way, namely, by denying the opposite (I. Th. iii. 13; I. Cor. i. 8; Col. i. 22). In these passages, and elsewhere, holiness is set in relation to the return of Christ as judge, when it will be displayed in its completeness and perfection. Toward this divinely intended end (Eph. ii. 10) coöperate not only all the divine powers but all the energies of the Christian himself (I. Th. v. 23; I. Cor. i. 8, 9; ix. 27; II. Cor. vii. 1; Rom. vii. 22; Phil. ii. 12, 13; iii. 12).

The word, redemption, (Gal. iii. 13; Rom. iii. 24), is quite as significant as either justification or reconciliation. Paul's own definition of it is "forgiveness of sins" (Col. i. 14; Eph. i. 7), but while, accordingly, he did not regard it as in result anything else than the release from the consequences of sin, yet the word inevitably suggests, and probably was chosen because it suggests, that escape was secured by means of cost and sacrifice. In the word, ransom, (I. Tim

ii. 6) this element of price[1] comes out clearly. Another meaning must be attached to the word, redemption, in Paul's most terse statement of the essentials of salvation (I. Cor. i. 30), where, after speaking of justification and sanctification, he adds redemption as a sort of climax. It is manifest that the apostle's own definition, forgiveness, noted above, is here unsatisfactory ; it cannot here, as so often, signify no more than justification, which has already been mentioned. The thought seems, by a not unnatural or unparalleled extension, to overleap the bounds of mere escape from positive infliction, and to include all the hopes which are associated with the grace of God in Christ Jesus. Occasionally in other statements of Paul redemption is made future and positive. For example, it signifies the

[1] The presence of the thought of cost or price has sometimes been disputed on the ground that this would require a third person who received the price. This, however, is unreasonably to extend the real value of the figure. The absurdity of such a statement is readily seen on analyzing the familiar saying, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Everybody knows that these words do not involve any idea of some one to take the price paid for freedom.

entrance of the body upon that glorious condition which shall complete the work of putting men into the rank of sons of God (Rom. viii. 23). Even after defining redemption as the remission or forgiveness of sins (Eph. i. 7), Paul goes on almost at once (Eph. 1. 14; iv. 30) to write about redemption as in the future, and in such a way as to show that he has in mind at once the completion of Christ's work in saving from evil and the consummation of blessing which shall attend his return.

Parallel to justification, which has a legal aspect, and to the mercantile words, ransom and redemption, stands the sacrificial idea of propitiation (Rom. iii. 25). While this word is used but once by Paul, yet this single case is so full, so studied, so explicit that we are justified in regarding it as throwing light upon an essential and important part of Paul's doctrine of salvation. From the derivation of the word it necessarily implies a becoming propitious on God's part towards sinners; that is, that instead of dealing with them with the severity which their

deeds deserve, he deals favorably with them. How he is able thus to deal with them is an element no less important than the first, but one which must be reserved for later discussion. The fact of a change in relation and behavior on the part of God toward men is here the one point to notice. That a change of sentiment as well as action would be implied if the word were used of men, does not show that the author attributed such a change to God, for such is the poverty of our ideas and language respecting the divine character and activity that it is possible to represent his relations only as we drape them in anthropomorphic statements. The whole course of Paul's teaching shows that he thinks not of God's becoming loving in sentiment toward men, but of his becoming favorable in dealing with them, and thus the propitiation of God is in substance another aspect of the justification of men.

One relation of believers receives from Paul such special emphasis as to demand particular consideration; namely, their sonship. To his

mind the relation between believers on the one hand and God and Christ on the other is so close that it demands for its portrayal the figure of family relationship (Gal. iv. 5–7; Rom. viii. 14–17; Eph. iii. 14, 15). It will be readily noted that this relation and the resulting rank of believers seems to the apostle so unlike their previous condition that he draws a figure from Roman law and custom, and styles their entrance upon it, adoption, just as Peter wrote (I. Pet. ii. 10) of those becoming a people of God who before were not such, and now having mercy which they had previously lacked. As remembrance of the pride which the covenant nation took in their relation to God makes Peter's expression additionally vivid, so knowledge of Roman law on adoption and inheritance helpfully illuminates Paul's teaching.

With the title and relation of sons Paul closely couples the further privilege of the gift of the Spirit. Not only is the Holy Spirit actually imparted to all believers (I. Th. iv. 8; I. Cor. iii. 16; Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iii. 2), but

this impartation serves on the one hand as a seal or ratification by God of our new relation to himself, and on the other hand as the means by which he carries out to final accomplishment his intended purification and perfecting of the already justified sinner. In the Spirit, who has been bestowed upon him and dwells in him, the Christian finds the center of his life, the source of his strength, the aid of his infirmities, and the guide of his action, so that the imparted Spirit is in a true sense the first payment on the great gifts which God intends and has promised to bestow on believers (II. Cor. i. 22; Gal. iv. 6; v. 16, 18, 25; Rom. viii. 14–16; Eph. i. 13, 14; iii. 16; iv. 30).

The single epistle to the Hebrews is necessarily much less full in its discussion of the nature of salvation than the many epistles of Paul, yet not a little may be gleaned on the subject from this single book. While the blessings of Christians, now and hereafter, are sometimes spoken of vaguely and indefinitely (i. 14; v. 9; vi. 9; ix. 28), yet they are usually, in

harmony with the chief purpose of the book, presented in contrast with the effects either of the Mosaic sacrifices or of the national covenant of Israel. Under the former aspect, the author declares that there has been provided purification of sins and eternal redemption (i. 3; ix. 12), phrases which as used can signify only the averting of the consequences of transgressions. He also draws out in detail the varied results of the work of Christ in their spiritual correspondence to the formal results of the earlier sacrifices, enumerating restoration to fitness for service (ix. 13, 14); atonement or propitiation (ix. 15); assured confidence (ix. 16–20), and the possibility of access to God without hindrance because of our guilt (ix. 21–24), to which may be added the high-priestly intercession of Christ in heaven (vi. 20; vii. 24, 25; viii. 1). Under the aspect of a covenant better than the former, the author sets forth both forgiveness of sins and the promise that our inward nature shall be brought into complete harmony with the will of God (viii. 10–12),

and the sharing of the peace of God in eternal freedom from all that disturbs (iv. 3, 9–11).

Turning to the teachings of John, we find that he emphasizes especially that phase of salvation which was brought most prominently forward in those discourses of Jesus which he records, namely, eternal life (Jn. iii. 16; I. Jn. ii. 25; iii. 14; iv. 9; v. 11–13). But while making much of life he does not stop with that thought. Like Paul he emphasizes in its turn the sonship of believers (Jn. i. 12, 13; I. Jn. iii. 1, 2). There is, however, this difference, that according to Paul's use of the figure men become children of God by adoption, but as John uses it, it comes to pass by a new birth. This fact shows that Paul contemplated chiefly the change in the relation, while John thinks of the novelty of the life itself which seems to him so great as to imply an absolutely fresh start. In John's doctrine as to the nature of salvation is included also the relation which the work of Christ sustains to sin. If John was not the only disciple who understood the testimony of John the Bap-

tist to Jesus as the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (Jn. i. 29), he is at any rate the only one who records it, and thus in some sense seems to make it his own. Both the possible meanings of the phrase, suffering for sin and removal of sin, play no small part in his own teachings. He uses the rare word, propitiation, (I. Jn. ii. 2 ; iv. 10) to describe what Christ accomplishes in relation to sins, this use necessarily implying that, even though he was the apostle of the love which is eternally divine as well as of that which is its human counterpart and reflection, he yet held the view that God's attitude toward unbelievers is unlike his attitude toward believers. He also uses the still more unusual word, cleanse (I. Jn. i. 7). This word, or its Hebrew equivalent, had been used to express the result of certain sacrifices, and this historical meaning ought to control its interpretation here, so that it implies improvement not so much of character as of condition, not an inward purifying but a making right in relation to God, and is thus equivalent to jus-

tification rather than to sanctification. To one trained to familiarity with the Jewish ritual, to cleanse from all sin would naturally, not to say necessarily, mean to remove the threatened consequences of sin. John teaches further that the actual ceasing to commit sin will in the end be likewise brought to pass (I. Jn. iii. 8; v. 3–5). But what he holds out to Christians as their crowning privilege is the knowledge of God (I. Jn. iv. 7, 8; v. 20). In harmony with a common use in the Bible of the word, know, to know God meant to John, not only a sympathetic apprehension of his character and works and ways, but also a loving appropriation of himself. Thus the climax of the teaching of John coincides with that deep saying of the Master himself about knowing God: a saying which, however, the beloved disciple left to the record of Matthew and Luke (Matt. xi. 27; Lk. x. 22).

CHAPTER VIII

THE BASIS OF SALVATION

During his whole ministry from its very beginning Jesus proclaimed salvation as possible, near and free to men. The only conditions and prerequisites were such as might and must be fulfilled by the man himself. It is easily to be recognized that a knowledge of the objective basis of salvation, whatever this may be, even though the nature of it might enhance its value in men's eyes and thus increase their readiness to accept it, would yet be in no sense indispensable to its acceptance; might never be gained by observation and experience; might conceivably never be furnished by revelation; and certainly, if the conditions were in any way to be fulfilled in human history, would in no case be made a prominent factor in preaching before they were fulfilled. Accordingly it need

be no matter of surprise that the basis on which salvation rests finds no place at all in the public discourses of Jesus. Even in his private conversations with the Twelve the case was not at first different. From his silence in relation to his death till a late point in his ministry, the inference has been drawn that he was himself unaware of the significance and even of the fact of his approaching death until that time, but this is a needless and violent inference, as the consciousness of a teacher, preëminently of a divine teacher, cannot safely be limited to the scope of his lessons. Until the disciples were fully convinced that he was in fact the promised Messiah, it would have been unwise to discuss with them his approaching death (Matt. xvi. 13–23); and not till the fact of his death had been repeatedly impressed on their minds could the further step be taken of instructing them as to the significance and value of this death.

At last, however, in an expression so terse as to ensure remembrance, even if comprehension was for a time at least impossible, Jesus sets

forth the great purpose of his life and at the same time the value of his death (Matt. xx. 28; Mk. x. 45). He must not only spend his life in service, but also surrender his life, and by this surrender provide a ransom, an objective basis of salvation, and, further, as obviating the sufferings of many others, even though the sufferings were different in kind, he might fitly say, as he did, that he gave his life in place of many. We have, then, from Jesus himself in one verse the three profound and far-reaching thoughts: that his death was an essential part of his original purpose; that it was by virtue of this death that salvation would come; and that this ransoming death might properly be termed substitutionary. Throughout the synoptic Gospels there is no word of teaching from Jesus which is inconsistent with the inferences just drawn, and if they find only a single confirmation from his lips, the occasion and character of this repetition were such as to give it the utmost possible weight and importance. At the institution of the Holy Supper, in the very night of his be-

trayal, he not only said of his body that it was given in behalf of his disciples (Lk. xxii. 19; compare I. Cor. xi. 24), a statement which fits best with that view of his death which makes it of the greatest value, but also said further, in connection with the handing of the cup, that it was "the blood of the covenant which is shed for many unto the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 28). Simply from the phrase "blood of covenant" it has often been inferred that the death of Christ had atoning worth, but the discussion of the matter by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. ix. 16–20) shows that in relation to a covenant the value of blood was thought to be its certification of validity, and by the recognition of this additional thought the cup will not lose but greatly gain in its contribution to Christian sentiment. But if the atoning value of the death of Christ cannot safely be inferred from his designation of it as covenant blood, on the other hand it cannot be excluded from the consequences which necessarily follow from the fact that he connects the

shedding of his blood with the remission of sins. The nature of this relation which his death bears to forgiveness is left undecided, but the fact of the relation, it will be noted, is positively asserted. Jesus clearly teaches that sins are to be remitted because he dies.

The record of Christ's discourses by John is in substantial harmony with that of the other evangelists, though it is earlier in his ministry that the fact of his dying as a basis for the salvation of men is brought out. It has, indeed, been made an objection to the trustworthiness even of the whole Gospel, that Jesus is reported as declaring so early in his public career as his first controversy with the Jews and his interview with Nicodemus, that he must die (ii. 19; iii. 14, 15). However no other meaning can be put on what he says about temple destruction and his being lifted up, and that the report of the former saying is accurate is confirmed by the coincidence with the testimony at his trial (Matt. xxvi. 61; Mk. xiv. 57, 58). In both cases, however, the teaching concerning death

was veiled in figurative language, and only in the latter case is his death connected with salvation. While we are justified in inferring from this passage that his death would make him the object of saving faith, yet how this was to come about is left unstated. At the very close of his life Jesus took up again the figure of uplifting (Jn. xii. 32), but here we are not at liberty to attach to the words any other thought than that of the moral power of his death over men. This truth might also be considered the lesson taught in the same conversation by the illustration of the grain of wheat (xii. 24–26), were it not that he there so associates death with service that we can scarcely fail to recognize that his own death was thought to be in some way positively helpful. In the allegory of the good shepherd (x. 11–15) Jesus again foretold the loss of his own life, and while the whole discussion was figurative,[1] the very form of the

[1] Care should constantly be taken not to confuse unconsciously the figurative with the fictitious. Figures express realities, and are employed only to secure a more effective expression of reality than literal language would give.

figure tended to emphasize the help which in some undefined way his death was sure to bring to those who trust him. He dies to secure their safety. That his death was not to be regarded as in any sense incidental or inevitable, still less that it was for himself in any way, appears in the words which follow (x. 17, 18), which read almost as if intended to guard against such a suggestion, but here, as throughout this Gospel, the teaching is limited to the declaration, that he must die, and that his death would benefit his own, while the definite relation between the death and the benefit remained either unexplained or unrecorded.

It is strongly confirmatory of the authenticity [1] of the speeches preserved in Acts that on the subject of the basis of salvation there is lacking in them even a repetition of such teaching as is given in the first three Gospels from Jesus himself. It was a long step for the first believ-

[1] That the record of John contains, as has just been noted, no developed teaching as to the significance of the death of Jesus, is no less confirmatory of its trustworthiness as a record.

ers to recognize Jesus in spite of his sufferings and death as yet the expected Messiah. At first they could do no more and needed to do no more than to declare that the Messiahship of Jesus was not shattered but in reality confirmed by his death on the cross. Nowhere in the brief reports of the first Christian sermons is there any discussion of the basis of salvation. The epistles of James and Jude are in every way as silent concerning the foundation on which redemption rests.

The epistles of Peter ground salvation on the death of Christ, and thus show that this thought and doctrine is as much a part of Petrine theology as it will later appear to be Pauline. Peter definitely asserts (I. Pet. i. 18, 19) that the blood of Christ is the basis of the believer's redemption. The significance of this assertion is enhanced by the connection in which it stands, the apostle seeming to take pains to bring out both the mercantile and the sacrificial aspects of the relation of the death of Christ to salvation, saying that it was not silver and

gold, which buys release, but was blood as of a spotless lamb, which propitiates. In using the word, blood, Peter only joins in the common apostolic designation of the death of Jesus, a designation in no way unnatural or surprising, especially for a death of such violence as crucifixion. A superficial view of certain Old Testament passages (Lev. xvii. 11; Deut. xii. 23) has sometimes resulted in confusion of thought, as they seem to teach that the blood is the life, while the New Testament uses blood for the death. A point of union of these two apparently diverse conceptions is found when it is remembered that in the Old Testament the blood is the life not as lived but as surrendered, and in the New Testament the blood is death regarded as the surrender or taking away of life. The ideas both of the violent shedding of blood and of the sacrificial surrender of life may have combined to render current in apostolic times the figure of blood for the laying down by Christ of his life on the cross. A further point in the teaching of Peter is that even when lay-

ing special stress on the value of the suffering of Jesus as our example (I. Pet. ii. 21–24), he stops to mention the other relation, still closer and more important, which it bears to us. Jesus suffered for us. Now, while it is not safe to insist that the preposition which is used here and in many other places does of itself assert vicariousness,[1] for primarily it signifies benefit, yet on the other side it is equally unjustifiable to hold that the frequent occurrence of this preposition in place of the more definite word is an argument of any weight against the idea of vicariousness, since, when a substitution may reasonably be inferred or presupposed, it is natural to use "for" in place of the needlessly definite "instead of." That a substitution was here the thought in the mind of the apostle is abundantly shown, not only by the assertion that our healing comes through his "wale," but still more clearly by the declaration that "he himself carried our sins in his body up on the tree." The last word shows conclusively that

[1] Both Thayer and Liddell and Scott allow this meaning.

Peter shared the usual New Testament view which makes the cross the scene of all the expiatory suffering of Jesus. In another passage (I. Pet. iii. 18) Peter regards the death of Christ not only as related to sin but also necessarily as vicarious, for if the advantage which the unrighteous gain from the suffering of the righteous is their own escape from suffering, it is impossible to deny some sort of substitution. It is well to note in addition that once (I. Pet. i. 3) the source of our hope is declared to be in some sense the resurrection of Jesus, but the true explanation of the passage is a recognition of the great part which the resurrection played and plays in Christian sentiment as the seal of God to every claim and offer and word of hope in Jesus.

The character of Paul's teaching as to the objective basis of salvation is in general familiar to every student. The amount and clearness of this teaching have thrown it into a prominence which is not as a matter of fact justified by any special peculiarity in its character. The advo-

cates of certain views have found Paul the authority to whom they could most conveniently appeal, and opponents of the same views have attempted to discredit them by asserting that they were original with Paul and peculiar to him. As will appear, the teachings of Paul differ in no essential particular from the views of Peter and John and Jesus himself. The thoughts which have been found to be furnished in the teachings of Christ and of Peter are, that it is by virtue of the death of Christ that salvation has become possible, and that this possibility was brought about in a way which involves a substitutionary or vicarious relation between what he suffered and what we deserved, that is to say, between himself and us. No more than this and no other than this, is the substance of the thought of Paul.

His own description of his message is "the word of the cross" and "Jesus and him crucified" (I. Cor. i. 18, 23; ii. 2; Gal. iii. 1). Frequently with a passing phrase he links salvation, especially in its aspects of justification and

forgiveness, with the death of Christ (Acts xx. 28; I. Cor. xv. 3; Gal. ii. 21; vi. 14; Eph. i. 7; ii. 16; Col. ii. 14). But we are not limited for our knowledge of Paul's theology, or his "gospel," as he would himself have termed it, to these incidental statements, unambiguous though they are. Paul makes the death of Christ to be the preëminent manifestation of his love, both because, as might well enough be, it was the extreme of condescension and suffering (Rom. xiv. 15), and because it was no less the extreme of helpfulness and service, in that in his death he was our representative (II. Cor. v. 14). Not only was his death so representative that it is possible to say that in it we died, but further the apostle declares, with a metonymy which though violent is perfectly intelligible and justifiable, that he was "made sin for us." If it is not admitted that the preposition here used implies that he was in our place, yet certainly it was on our account and for our advantage, as it was our fate in which he was involved. Elsewhere (Rom. iii. 24, 25) Paul

centers justification, redemption, propitiation, and the exhibition of the divine righteousness, all in the blood of Christ Jesus. This statement is confirmed by the later declaration (Rom. v. 9, 10) that blood is the basis of justification and death of atonement or reconciliation. Closely akin to the substitution necessarily involved in the fact of the sinless becoming sin for us, and reminding us equally of Peter's expression "the righteous for the unrighteous," is the assertion, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us" (Gal. iii. 13). From a careful study of these declarations and their necessary implications, it is evident that there has been no error in attributing to Paul the conception that the death of Christ constitutes in some very real way the objective basis of the salvation which God provides for men through his Son. As to how the death of Christ became the basis of salvation, the apostle does not speak as clearly. He speaks of our being "bought with a price" (I. Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23); he speaks of the exhibition of God's

righteousness, and of the condemnation of sin in connection with the coming of Christ, whose coming was in form an incarnation and in purpose related to sin (Rom. iii. 25; viii. 3). In the light of earlier statements (Rom. vi. 5–10) it appears that in Paul's mind the condemnation of sin, like the exhibition of righteousness, was related, if not solely, at any rate chiefly, to Christ's death. As far as theories of the atonement are concerned, it may be said that the mercantile, governmental and sacrificial theories are each and all consistent with his language at one time or another or even implied in it, but that none of these seems to have been consciously developed by the apostle himself, or to exhaust his conception or the contents of his teaching.

It must be noted further that in a few passages (I. Cor. xv. 17; Rom. iv. 25) especial stress is laid on the resurrection as related to salvation, but nowhere in such a manner as to set it in the apostle's teachings alongside the death of Christ as a basis of salvation. In the

former passage the resurrection is regarded as the only tangible proof which was absolutely decisive of the authority and power of Christ; in the second it is most satisfactory and reasonable to think of the resurrection as securing our justification by serving to convince men, so that they seek the justification which in reality is based upon the death of him who is now risen. It is a subjective, not an objective, basis of justification. In some other passages it is the present life of Christ on which the marked stress is laid (Rom. v. 10; vi. 8–11; Col. ii. 12, 13), and it is certainly unfortunate that this thought of Paul in regard to the living Christ should have been overlooked so much as it has been, since the thought of the living and inliving Christ (Gal. ii. 20) is as truly an essential part of his system as is the cross itself, though in an entirely different way. Christ's life is the present and continual power by which salvation passes from being merely possible to being in all respects actual; but it was his death which was the objective basis of salvation — was that, in view

of which, God forgives sinners and receives them into favor.

While the language of Paul, if it does not render necessary the theory that the death of Christ largely served the needs of the divine government, is at any rate perfectly consistent with that view (Rom. iii. 25, 26), the epistle to the Hebrews on the other hand seems to regard it almost exclusively under the aspect of a sacrifice. Starting from what the author regards as an authoritative because prophetic designation of Christ as a priest (Ps. cx. 4; Heb. vii. 17), he proceeds to inquire for the sacrifice which a priest must necessarily offer in order to be a true priest, and finds it in his own blood (vii. 27; viii. 3; ix. 11, 12, 14, 15, 22, 28; x. 12, 19; xiii. 12). His thought is that Christ presents himself to God in behalf of men as one who has voluntarily undergone suffering, even death, to obviate suffering on their part, and that God bestows favors else impossible upon men in view of the death of Christ, so that to one trained in the symbolism of sacrifice the

relation of Christ to the Father in behalf of men could best be described as an offering of himself or as the sacrificial presentation of his own blood. Once (x. 5–10) the author might on first reading be understood as holding that the worth of the work of Christ consists in his doing the will of the Father, which would make the perfect life rather than the death of Christ the basis of salvation, but the conclusion of this very passage shows the inconsistency of that idea with the thought of the author, for the will of God is represented as having been supremely done in the sacrificial offering of the "body of Christ once for all."

As John is in method a seer, not a logician, it is not surprising that there is little of dogmatic teaching as to the objective basis of salvation to be found either in his letters or in the reflections which are embodied in his Gospel. He wrote in order that believers might have the assurance that Jesus is the Son of God, and that they might have the inward assurance and appropriation of eternal life, not at all to argue

or to assert what are the grounds of redemption. The first clue as to his own view is to be found in the teaching of John the Baptist, which, as has been said, John the evangelist, his hearer and disciple, so records as in some sense to appropriate its sentiment. Twice the Baptist speaks of Jesus as the Lamb of God, once with the addition, "who bears away the sin of the world" (Jn. i. 29, 36). It is not necessary now to discuss whether the appellation, Lamb, could have been derived only from the use of lambs in sacrifice. If, as may be regarded as more probable, its source was not Leviticus but Isaiah, the conception of substitutionary suffering will be, if anything, still more clearly involved. In Isaiah, sin is taken away only as the Lord has laid on one the iniquity of us all; only as when he was cut off from the land of the living the stroke was for the people; only as he made his soul a sacrificial offering to remove the guilt of others (Is. liii. 7–12).[1] The same

[1] While that view of the "Suffering Servant" is accepted above, which makes the phrase refer to a person, yet the presence of the substitutionary conception does not depend on the personal interpretation.

idea is brought out still more directly in the advice of Caiaphas with John's own comment upon it (Jn. xi. 49–52). That the suffering of Jesus averted destruction from the children of God throughout the world, the evangelist takes for granted. The only point on which his readers required instruction was as to the significance of the language of the high priest. When propitiation of sin is spoken of (I. Jn. ii. 2 ; iv. 10), he merely connects it with the person of Christ without specification as to what aspect of his person or work is particularly concerned, but when the promise is of cleansing (I. Jn. i. 7), which to those trained in the Mosaic ritual must have been no less clearly a sacrificial conception, this cleansing is directly associated with the blood, by which of course the death of Jesus is intended. This may be said to exhaust the teaching of the Gospel and epistles on this point. If, as was premised, there is little to show that the death of Christ is the objective basis of salvation, there is, it is to be noted, nothing at all to disprove it or to

suggest any other conception. When we turn to the Revelation, a striking difference at once appears. There salvation in all its aspects is continually and emphatically associated with the blood of him whose most characteristic representation is that of a Lamb seeming as if slain (i. 5; v. 6, 9, 12; vii. 14; xii. 11). While these statements are descriptive rather than dogmatic, yet they are utterly unintelligible save as we attribute to the author and to the whole church of that apostolic age the recognition of the death of Christ as the basis of salvation, a recognition which gains immensely in significance in case the theory of the Neronian date is accepted for the Apocalypse.

It appears, then, as the result of this survey that no one of the New Testament authors dissents from the teaching which is found in the others, but that, so far as any speak, from the preaching of John the Baptist to the visions of John the apostle, all teachers concur in one conception of the basis on which salvation has become possible. To be sure the idea is often

expressed figuratively, and the death of Christ is called a price, a sacrificial offering, a propitiation, but all these terms express one and the same idea; namely, that by dying Jesus removed all objective hindrances and made salvation possible. No one of the writers suggests that the hindrances which Christ removed consisted in any part or in any way of lack of love on the part of God. Paul conclusively sets this aside by asserting that the death of Christ to bring about the reconciliation of God and man was itself an exhibition of the divine love, and by asserting again that God himself did in Christ the work of reconciliation (Rom. v. 8–11; II. Cor. v. 18, 19). All the authors agree, so far as they speak, that the death of Christ was truly substitutionary, since they tell us that it was the assumption by the guiltless one of condemnation which belonged to sinners, and of sufferings which obviate theirs. The death of Christ in the place of sinners is the New Testament doctrine as to the basis of salvation.

CHAPTER IX

THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION

All the writers of the New Testament agree in teaching that any and every objective hindrance to the salvation of sinners has been by the death of Christ finally removed; that salvation is in reality as well as in form offered to all, and that now it only remains for the soul itself to fulfill the conditions of salvation, whatever they may be. The teaching as to these conditions should, then, be next investigated.

The synoptic report of the preaching of Christ begins with the statement that he took up and repeated, as his own first message, the theme of John the Baptist, "Repent" (Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17; Mk. i. 15). The full significance of this summons may not be appreciated at first, for the use of this word is practically confined to its religious sense or to meanings derived from it,

so that no familiar applications form a ladder to the theological significance, and the root itself is employed only in this circle of almost purely religious words. Further, popular sentiment has attached to the word, repent, a meaning which is decidedly unlike its Biblical sense. To many minds repentance conveys little if any idea beyond that of sorrow, intense it may be, but it may equally be utterly futile. The Greek word[1] which is properly rendered repentance, and which if not the original word of the Master, must reproduce of course the effect of his Aramaic expression on his hearers, by its very derivation demands a profounder meaning than mere sorrow, even though it were remorse. The effect of the word can scarcely be better reproduced in English than as "after-mind," just as the saying "Second thoughts are best" necessarily implies that the second judgment is different from the first and presumably better. But it would be merely a change of errors with

[1] Another word is used (Matt. xxvii. 3) for vain regret of Judas.

no real gain if the sphere of repentance were limited to the judgment instead of the feelings. It is in view of the mind as controlling action that an after mind is demanded. Repentance as originally preached was a change of moral attitude and behavior; nothing less than a moral revolution. This thought with which, as we have seen, Jesus began his ministry, continued to hold its place throughout his work (Matt. xxi. 29–32; Lk. xi. 32; xvi. 30, 31). The duty of repentance and the consequences of failure to repent were declared with great force in special reference to those who disregarded his teachings (Matt. xi. 20–24: xii. 41). He came to call sinners to repentance; without repentance all must perish; repentance brings joy to the very heart of God himself surrounded by the holy angels (Lk. v. 32; xiii. 3, 5; xv. 7, 10).

Beyond the demand for repentance, Jesus further demanded acceptance of himself and supreme devotion to himself. In his "Come unto me" (Matt. xi. 28–30) — as emphatic in self-assertion as winning in welcome — he sets

himself before men as the one fountain of spiritual blessing. So complete is the satisfaction which he imparts that he cannot imagine his disciples sad in his company (Matt. ix. 15). To receive him is to receive God himself; personal service to him is proof that sins are already forgiven, and service to his disciples will result in eternal reward and blessedness (Matt. xxv. 31–46; Mk. ix. 37; Lk. vii. 44–51). So absolutely supreme is the relation of the soul to him that on confession or denial of him hang the issues of the future life. Devotion beyond even filial love, beyond the love of life itself, is demanded, and while readiness to sacrifice everything for his sake is required, he promises more than a recompense for every loss (Matt. v. 11; x. 32–39; xvi. 16, 17; xix. 29; Lk. ix. 59, 60; xiv. 26, 33). With such claims Jesus presents himself to men, requiring only in exceptional cases personal attendance, but insisting invariably, whenever the question is raised, on supreme and single devotion of soul and life. Of course, conformity to his teachings is in some

measure required, but it is clear that the effect of his words is to make prominent and primary, not submission to teachings and obedience to commands, but that relation of supreme devotion to the person of Christ which is best called "faith."

The two demands which we find in the synoptic Gospels, for repentance and for faith, are not to be thought of as antagonistic, or as alternative, or even as supplementary to each other. They are set forth as if they were two aspects of one and the same requirement. Each is impossible without the other. It is taken for granted that no man will repent in view of Christ without accepting him, and in turn that acceptance of him is impossible without that complete break with the old life and sentiment of sin which constitutes repentance. While other demands than for penitent faith are sometimes made, it will appear, as they are studied, that these demands are general and indeterminate, as obedience to the teachings of Christ or to God, or thorough acceptance of the word and

devotion to it (Matt. vii. 21–27; xii. 50; xiii. 3–8, 19–23); or are proofs and results of faith, such as acts of love (Lk. vii. 47; x. 27; Matt. xxv. 34–46); or are merely other aspects of faith, as abjuration of self (Matt. xvi. 24); or are limited to the special circumstances and needs of a single individual (Matt. xix. 21). The one condition of salvation according to the synoptic teaching of Jesus is turning from sin to himself.

There are some statements of Jesus which might be taken to imply the necessity of action on the part of God as a condition of salvation. Once, at least (Matt. xxii. 14), he seems definitely to condition salvation on the divine choice, and the word used in this passage is used in many others, being usually rendered "elect" (Matt. xxiv. 22, 24, 31; Lk. xviii. 7). Only by a forced exegesis can these statements be robbed of their natural meaning that believers have been in some way chosen of God. Upon what this divine choice depends we have no basis for assertion, but we note that the divine choice is

never made to depend on a previous choice of God by men, but is made to anticipate their action. It may further be said in reference to the divine activity thus partially declared, first, that it in no sense supersedes the fulfillment of the one condition of salvation, which is penitent faith, but rather results in it; second, that God's choice of any soul does not make repentance and faith impossible or additionally difficult on the part of any other soul, but that their action remains entirely unaffected; and, third, that the divine election is commonly presented by Jesus as a token of grace and an unfailing source of comfort (Lk. xviii. 7; Mk. xiii. 20; Matt. xix. 26). Until these elements are combined we certainly fall short of the thought of Jesus. In any case, however, election is not a condition of salvation, or a substitute for the conditions, but a help to the performance of the conditions. The teaching on the subject of the divine choice of men, however suggestive in spite of its brevity and reticence, and however important in some of its aspects and relations, gives no new condition of salvation.

John records the teaching of Jesus as to the conditions of salvation in such a way as to make an impression at first sight decidedly unlike that of the synoptic records. This unlikeness is nowhere more conspicuous than in the complete absence from all John's report of the word, repent. The converse of repentance, which is faith or, rather, believing receives, however, from John increased emphasis. It is unfortunate that in English the verb, believe, and the noun, faith, come from different roots, so that their relation is obscured. In the study of John alone this fact would be of less consequence, as, in contrast with the synoptics, he never mentions the substantive idea of faith, but in all the forty cases of his discussion of the matter, he emphasizes, by the use of the verbal form, the activity of the believing soul. The approach to faith is not the same in John as in the synoptic Gospels. There the frequent demand for faith in relation to bodily healing paves the way for a corresponding temper in regard to spiritual healing or forgiveness; in

John the road to believing is built of the thoughts of the acceptance of the statements of others as well as of Jesus himself (v. 46, 47; iii. 12; viii. 45), and acceptance of truths relating to him, such as his Messiahship, his mission and his relation to the Father (xiv. 10, 11; xvi. 27; xi. 42; xiii. 19), until faith or believing finally appears as spiritual union with the personal Christ by entrance into relation with him, appropriation, in a word (xi. 25, 26; xiv. 1). It may accordingly be said that in the synoptic Gospels faith is regarded under the aspect of unfaltering confidence; in John under the aspect of personal appropriation and resulting union; but that these aspects, while variant, are in no sense inconsistent. In John other requirements are also found, less frequently than the command to believe, requirements which differ from it in form, but in form only. Such are: hearing (v. 25; viii. 43; xii. 47); coming (vi. 35, 37, 65; vii. 37); following (viii. 12; xii. 26); keeping or abiding in the word or commandments of Christ (viii. 31, 51, 52; xiv. 15,

21–24; xv. 10); abiding in himself (vi. 56; xv. 4–10); drinking the water which he supplies (iv. 10, 14; vii. 37); eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man (vi. 53–58); but all these are manifestly only figurative presentations of the original or continued acceptance of Christ, of the personal relation of appropriation which is the Johannine aspect of faith.

Like the synoptic writers, John preserves teaching of Jesus as to the need and fact in relation to salvation of a divine activity on the human soul. To Nicodemus he declares the universal necessity of regeneration by the power of the Holy Spirit (iii. 3, 5), and later (vi. 44, 45) he asserts that a drawing by the Father, which he also calls a teaching, is indispensable. The relation between the divine activity which is thus indispensable and the human activity on which salvation is conditioned is nowhere stated, but it is implied in Christ's teaching. The activity of God must precede believing and be independent of it, for to make birth a voluntary

activity of the one born, is to make the metaphor absolutely nonsensical. To make the drawing which overcomes the soul's unwillingness to be itself a result of the willingness of the same soul is no less absurd, while to regard this drawing as universal robs it of all argumentative force. Further, to secure and bring about either regeneration or drawing is not represented in any of the discourses as a duty of man, but as a necessity for man if he is to be saved, not as obligatory but as indispensable. Lastly, the practical application of the thought of the divine activity is suggestive, if not, indeed, conclusive, as, while in the synoptic discourses mention is made of the divine choice in order to comfort, in John it is used as a warning to unbelievers, that they may be impressed with a sense of their helplessness in their willful persistence in sin, and their absolute dependence on divine power. The whole relation of regeneration and faith, of drawing and coming, is illuminated by the declaration that the source of unbelief is unwillingness to believe (v. 40).

While, then, the work of God is preliminary to that of man, and regeneration becomes by the slavery of sin an indispensable necessity in order to faith, yet to believe is the single condition of salvation.

It is in no way surprising that on this point, as on so many others, the earliest apostolic preaching links itself most closely to such preaching of Jesus as the synoptists record. The first demand of the apostles was for repentance, a demand made with all the more force because of the judicial murder of their Master, which they continually charged home upon the Jewish people (Acts ii. 38; iii. 13–15; v. 30). At the same time they gave no less a message of faith in Christ, of trust that through him richest blessings should be bestowed (Acts ii. 21; iii. 16; iv. 12; v. 31; viii. 22; x. 43; xi. 17). Thoughts of sin and self lead to repentance, thoughts of Christ and salvation to faith. With this double demand is also associated the requirement of baptism, not as an additional or a coördinate condition of salvation, but as the

expression and completion of penitent faith (Acts ii. 38, 41 ; viii. 38 ; compare Mk. i. 4).

James does not discuss the conditions of salvation, but treats of the tests, proofs and results of faith. He adds a single mention of regeneration (i. 18), declaring that this voluntary and uncaused act of God is a crowning proof of his goodness. Had Jude not been hindered from preparing his treatise on the common salvation, he would doubtless have furnished, what now he does not give, his discussion of its conditions. Peter, addressing both his letters to those who have already experienced the graciousness of God, only incidentally mentions faith, the condition of salvation, baptism which he regards as the public symbol of a right disposition toward God, and regeneration (I. Pet. i. 9 ; iii. 21 ; i. 23 ; compare i. 1, 2).

The teachings of Paul as to the conditions of salvation are in close harmony with the teachings already discussed. In his oral teachings preserved in Acts he emphasizes in turn as may be most helpful both aspects of conversion

(xiv. 15; xxvi. 18), namely, repentance (xvii. 30; xxvi. 20), and faith (xiii. 39; xvi. 31; xix. 2), combining the two in his summary of his preaching (xx. 21). While in a great part of his letters he, like James, Jude and Peter, has little to say as to the conditions of entrance on the Christian life, and for the same reasons as they, yet controversies forced him to write also clear and to some extent formal definitions and discussions on this subject. A cardinal point in his struggle with the Judaizing element in the churches was whether observance of the Mosaic law was in any way essential to salvation. The first demand of those whom Paul opposed was of course for circumcision, but if this rite or any other command was obligatory as a condition of salvation, so was the whole law, since it is an indivisible unit (Gal. v. 3). But while the observance of the law might be regarded, in theory at least, as a means of attaining salvation, practically it was not such, since it is invariably unsuccessful (Gal. iii. 10–12, 21; Rom. iii. 20; iv. 15). To be sure the contention of

the Jews was in form not "Salvation by the Law without Christ," but "Salvation by the Law as a necessary supplement to Christ" (Acts xv. 1, 5, 24), but Paul tore away the veil of their sophistries and showed the real issue to be "Salvation either by Christ or by Law" (Gal. ii. 16–21; iii. 1–6, 10–14; v. 2, 4, 6; Rom. iii. 21, 28; iv. 14; viii. 3). In contrast with the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, who dwells on the helpfulness of the law and its instructive foreshadowings of Christian realities, Paul, while never denying the helpfulness of the law in these relations, is obliged to neglect it, in order to combat the misuse of the law which would hinder instead of helping the reception of Christ and the acceptance of his work. In this teaching as to the sufficiency of Christ, repentance sinks comparatively out of sight, perhaps lest it should be regarded as a meritorious work, and faith, simple reception of salvation in no way deserved, comes out in bold relief (Gal. ii. 16; iii. 5, 11; Rom. i. 16, 17; iii. 25, 28, 30; v. 1, 2; Phil. iii. 9; Eph. ii. 8). In faith itself the

element of which Paul made the most is acceptance. Though confident trust is not overlooked (Rom. iv. 17–21), and union with Christ by personal appropriation of him is fully recognized (Gal. ii. 20; I. Cor. xv. 17, 18), Paul yet regards faith as being preëminently acceptance of God's gracious gift, as being opposed not so much to questioning distrust of God, or alienation from God or Christ, as to self-confident indifference to God's own appointed way of salvation. Regarded thus as the reception of salvation provided and offered, faith is the single condition of salvation. Faith saves, and only faith saves. Yet it is possible to lay an unfair and un-Pauline stress on the thought of faith only. Although he never enters on a formal discussion of this point, it is equally true that he never uses language which would fairly imply that faith can remain solitary and without consequences. He too, would say like James, that a supposed, ostensible faith, unfruitful, unaccompanied by suitable activity, must be a counterfeit, not a genuine faith. That this is his real

conception, is shown by the demands which he unceasingly makes upon believers as believers, and also by his claim that faith fully accomplishes what law fails to accomplish (Rom. iii. 31; viii. 4).

While in Paul's teaching the sole condition of salvation is faith, he further, quite as emphatically as any author in the New Testament, emphasizes the antecedent relation of God to the activity of the soul. Such words frequently occur as, calling (I. Th. v. 24; II. Th. i. 11; I. Cor. i. 2, 24, 26; Rom. i. 6, 7; viii. 28, 30; Eph. iv. 4; I. Tim. vi. 12; II. Tim. i. 9), choice (II. Th. ii. 13; Eph. i. 4), appointment (I. Th. v. 9), election (I. Th. i. 4; Rom. viii. 33; Col. iii. 12; II. Tim. ii. 10), and predetermination (Rom. viii. 29, 30; Eph. i. 5, 11). Whenever the apostle finds faith, he recognizes it as the result of the gracious activity of God, and he further rests with assured confidence on the thought that God will not fail to complete the work which he has begun (I. Th. v. 24; II. Th. iii. 3; I. Cor. i. 9; Rom. viii. 38, 39; xiv. 4;

Phil. i. 6 ; Eph. ii. 4–8). This latter relation of thought is in reality even more decisive as to his view than is the use of the words which have been cited, definite and significant though they are. But while Paul thus believed in the anticipatory purpose and activity of God, he regarded it as in no way superseding or hindering human activity ; so far from that, more clearly than any other writer of the New Testament he brings out the thought that God's purpose and activity attains its end in and through human activity, consequent yet free (II. Th. ii. 13–16 ; Phil. ii. 12, 13 ; iii. 13, 14 ; Eph. ii. 10 ; iv. 1).

In tone the writer to the Hebrews diverges decidedly from Paul, with whom he yet has on the whole the closest affinities. Like Paul — if it were possible, more than he — this author emphasizes faith, but apparently applies the name to a different concept. To him, faith is conviction of the existence and value of the unseen and confident expectation of that which is not yet received (xi. 1). But on consideration it will appear that the diversity is in appearance rather

than in reality. The same jewel has been turned to display another facet. His language, often quoted as an exhaustive definition of faith, is accurately descriptive of it in one of its aspects, but it does not necessarily bring out all its aspects or any part of the essential nature of faith. As a confident trust in Jesus faith always, even when he was present, outran the seen, and anticipated in its expectation what it was desired and hoped that he would bestow. As appropriation of Christ which accomplishes union with him, it necessarily transcends the limits of the visible and the present. As reception of God's salvation in God's way, it no less demands conviction of the unseen and confidence as to the future. But the difficulty which the writer to the Hebrews is seeking to remove from his readers, is of such a nature that he naturally lays sole stress on this element, though it is comparatively superficial. In the same way, though he regards repentance as primary necessity (vi. 6; xii. 17), yet he includes it, like faith, among the rudiments of Christ, both in teaching

and life, and hurries on from it to profounder truths for maturer disciples (vi. 1).

When we take up the letters of John and consider what he says touching the conditions of salvation, we seem to be again transported into the sphere of those teachings of Jesus which he has especially recorded. In the Revelation, which deals with the warfare on a world-wide scale of good and evil, Christ and Satan, there is much mention of repentance (Rev. ii. 5, 16, 21, 22; iii. 3, 19; ix. 20, 21; xvi. 9, 11), but in his letters and in his original contributions to his Gospel John is silent as to repentance, though to be sure it would necessarily underlie confession which he explicitly commands (I. Jn. i. 9). In all his writings faith finds little mention, by name at least, but to believe, which means to enter into relations with Jesus, is made much of, especially in the epistles (Jn. iii. 16, 17, 36; xx. 31; I. Jn. v. 1, 10, 13). Besides this word, believe, we find several equivalent words and phrases, the use of which more or less interprets it, as receiving Christ (Jn. i. 11,

12), confession, which is in these passages the expression not of repentance but of faith (I. Jn. ii. 23; iv. 15; II. Jn. 7), and abiding in Christ and God (I. Jn. ii. 6; iii. 6; iv. 13, 15). In relation to the origin of faith, John, like his fellow apostles, does not fail to attribute an important part to God. He recognizes that both love and the reception of Christ prove a divine birth or begetting (Jn. i. 13; I. Jn. iv. 7; v. 1). The relation between them he never definitely states, but the divine begetting is certainly nowhere represented as dependent on faith or on any other human activity, and it is never set forth as an end to be sought. These facts show that the apostle thought of it as a result of God's independent and prevenient love, which, while securing its own ends, neither hinders the exercise of free will on the part of the regenerate, nor diminishes the responsibility of the unregenerate. It follows that penitent faith, which is the constant duty of every man, is the single condition which, complied with, ensures salvation.

CHAPTER X

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SALVATION

THE saving work which is to be accomplished by Christ is not regarded by the New Testament writers as completed in the fulfillment of the indispensable and primary condition of it, which is penitent faith. So far from it, salvation is regarded, in its relations alike to the individual himself and to the community of redeemed of which he forms a part, as a gradual and more or less prolonged process. It will be necessary to note the varying aspects of this recognition, and the conditions under which and the agencies by which the process is performed.[1]

While the synoptic reports of Jesus represent

[1] For theoretical completeness it would be still further necessary to discuss the several duties which are demanded of the believer, but for practical reasons this topic, which might be called New Testament Ethics, is omitted, as well as the doctrines and precepts touching the local church in all its relations.

him as bringing a gift of salvation to be received by penitent faith, they no less represent him as setting forth an ideal of character and behavior to be attained, which ideal he often styles righteousness (Matt. v. 6; vi. 1, 33; vii. 19, 20, 24–27; x. 41; xiii. 43; xxii. 11–13; xxv. 34–46). While Jesus did not, like the Pharisees, regard righteousness as the basis of entrance into the Messianic kingdom and salvation (Lk. xvii. 10; xviii. 9–14), he yet greatly elevated and intensified the conception of it. Righteousness must begin in the very soul (Matt. xii. 33; Lk. vi. 45; xi. 39–44); it must cover all activities (Matt. vii. 12; xv. 11–20); it must satisfy only when absolutely conformed to the standard of what God himself is (Matt. v. 9, 20, 45, 47; xii. 50). Of the conditions and agencies of the attainment of this ideal little is said, but it is continually implied that there will be a strenuous, prolonged and unceasing struggle, and that the danger of failing to attain the ideal can be averted only by diligence, prayer and the sacrifice of much that has been held precious (Matt.

x. 24–26; xviii. 6–9; xxiv. 42–xxv. 30; Mk. xiii. 33; xiv. 38; Lk. xxi. 34–36). To the blessings which Jesus offered there was a distinctly social aspect, and the development of salvation on its social side, the growth of the community or kingdom of Christ, would be gradual. It was especially in the great group of kingdom parables, the giving of which inaugurated the second chief stage of his Messianic activity, that Jesus set forth at once the certainty and the gradualness of this growth of the community of the saved (Matt. xiii. 1–50; Mk. iv. 1–34). Like the mustard the kingdom must and will extend out of all proportion to the smallness of its beginning; as the leaven transforms, its power must and will increasingly affect the world; and yet evil will continue beside it, like the tares beside the wheat, continue even within its nominal scope, like the worthless fish enclosed within the net; and all this may be expected to endure until the final consummation.

In John's report the idea of the gradual development of eternal life sinks out of sight in

comparison with the thought of its possession. It is not here a matter of progress but of abiding, of continually keeping the commandments, and of fruit-bearing (Jn. xv. 4–10). The church is in like manner chiefly regarded as being, not as becoming, although becoming is not positively excluded in the case of either the individual or the community. The activity of the Holy Spirit is more fully recognized in this Gospel than in the synoptic reports (Jn. vii. 39; xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 13–15; xx. 22, 23; compare Matt. x. 20; Lk. xi. 13; xii. 12), but even here the discussion is far from complete.

It could hardly be expected that the early preaching of the apostles, of necessity almost exclusively occupied with the demand for repentance and faith, the beginning of salvation, would give much place to discussion of its development. This would all the more be expected, because at first even the apostles themselves do not seem fully to have comprehended the greatness of the interval which Jesus hinted at in his phrase "After a long time" (Matt.

xxv. 19), but rather to have supposed that the consummation of individual and social salvation would follow hard upon its beginning. From the first, stress was laid on the fact of the presence of the Spirit (Acts ii. 38; v. 3, 4, 9, 32; xi. 15–17). The development of the Christian community under the leadership of the apostles was simple in the extreme. The so-called "community of goods" (Acts ii. 44, 45; compare v. 4; xii. 12) was such in no technical and socialistic sense of the phrase, being no required surrender of property but merely a voluntary and temporary beneficence. The extension of the church beyond the limits of Judaism was accepted, though at first with some misgivings (Acts viii. 14; x. 1 — xi. 18; xv. 7–29; Gal. ii. 1–21).

James in his epistle presents a lofty ideal of character, that one should be "perfect and entire, lacking in nothing," "unspotted from the world," "a perfect man" (i. 4, 27; iii. 2). The details of this ideal are wrought out negatively in the warnings and counsels which make

this letter so rich a treasury of ethical instruction. That this ideal was as yet unrealized, that the saved soul is only gradually perfected, is manifest from the multitude and earnestness of the apostle's warnings. Only by strenuous endeavor, only by works which verify words and demonstrate faith, can the ideal be reached. Of the growing and rising community of believers it was still too early, when James wrote, to say much, though mutual helpfulness in material as well as spiritual matters is encouraged (i. 27; ii. 15, 16; v. 14, 16, 19, 20), and dissensions must already have arisen, for they are discouraged. Jude wrote chiefly in warning, but at the same time sees the ideal character in an unblemished and perfect condition of the soul. This, however, is still future, and there is immediate and pressing danger of moral fall instead of progress. So he urges spiritual development on the basis of faith, with prayer "in the Holy Spirit" as the means by which it will be secured (20). Of the joint life of Christians he speaks only as he warns against the faithless

and seducing errorists or encourages to the rescue of endangered souls.

Peter in his first epistle sets the standard of Christian endeavor as high as it had been set in the Sermon on the Mount, making it parallel to the holiness of God and to the perfectness of Jesus himself (i. 15, 16; ii. 21). At the same time his recognition of the fact that in practice this standard is still unattained is plainly to be seen from his warnings (i. 14; ii. 11, 21; iii. 7; iv. 15; v. 2, 8), from his encouragement to growth (ii. 2), and from his assurance that later God will give established perfection (v. 10). While the Christian's progress in morality is ascribed to the Holy Spirit (i. 2), every one of the manifold injunctions which are contained in the letter implies and involves the responsibility and duty of the man himself. While the stress of Peter, like that of his fellows, falls mainly on the life and development of the individual, yet the community is recognized both in its ideal condition (ii. 9) and in its real condition, as suffering troubles from without and as affording

scope within itself for mutual helpfulness (i. 6; iii. 16; iv. 4–11; v. 9). So far as this topic is concerned the second epistle does not differ essentially from the first. The Christian ideal is spotlessness of character (iii. 14), yet gradual development of character is surely recognized, because it is demanded (i. 5–7; iii. 18), and because warnings imply, as always, a lack of attainment which can be remedied only by individual diligence (i. 9, 10; iii. 17). As to community relations, we are given only so much as is involved in warnings against the false teachers who had already sprung up within the church.

Paul in his writings holds up an ideal to be attained in the renewed life of the Christian, which certainly is not less lofty than that presented by the other apostles. On the one side it is no less than perfect performance of every moral requirement (I. Th. iv. 1–7; Phil. iv. 8), on the other no less than complete conformity to the pattern set by the sinless Lord himself (Rom. viii. 29; Eph. v. 2; Phil. ii. 5). Not

that he regards this ideal as already attained or easily attainable (Phil. iii. 12–14). Nowhere are warnings against moral dangers and rebukes for moral delinquencies more frequent and more earnest than from the pen of the apostle to the Gentiles. Nor does he know any short and easy method of attaining the ideal which he cherishes. To attain the fullness of salvation the soul itself must strenuously endeavor, with vigilance and sobriety, with fear and trembling, with a persistence in well-doing, that knows no weariness or abatement of effort (I. Th. v. 6; Rom. xiii. 11–14; Phil. ii. 12–14; Gal. vi. 9; II. Th. iii. 13). But while the soul itself must enlist and expend its utmost energies without ceasing or slackening, it is not destitute of divine aid (I. Cor. i. 8, 9; I. Th. v. 23, 24; Phil. ii. 13). Indeed, Paul's recognition of this divine aid is so emphatic and constant that he has sometimes been misunderstood and thought to regard the soul as passive instead of most intensely active in the matter of attaining the ideal of character and behavior. To be sure

he teaches that Christians are already by the effective call of God "saints" and "holy" (Rom. i. 7; I. Cor. i. 2; iii. 17; Eph. i. 1), and that our sanctification as well as our justification is from God through Christ in the Spirit (I. Th. v. 23; I. Cor. i. 30). But while the apostle over and over asserts that justification is conditioned solely upon faith and is at once fully and finally attained by the exercise of faith, sanctification is never so conditioned; on the other hand the need of personal endeavor is emphatically asserted, even alongside the assurance of divine aid (I. Th. iv. 3; Phil. ii. 12; iii. 12). At the same time it must be recognized that the inward work of the Holy Spirit finds with Paul a place and importance beyond what any other New Testament writer gives it. While, to be sure, in recognizing and emphasizing the initial work of God upon the soul in regeneration, this is not formally attributed to the activity of the Spirit, yet the fact is insisted on that all believers possess the Spirit, not only by external relation, but still more by

inward reception and permanent indwelling (I. Th. iv. 8; Eph. i. 13, 14; I. Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 19; Rom. viii. 9). While he regards this gift of the Spirit as God's seal set upon the soul's reception of himself and as the "earnest" of all blessings promised and hoped for (Rom. viii. 11; II. Cor. v. 5), Paul does not stop with this, but goes on to represent the Holy Spirit within the soul as the secret and power of the renewed and bettered and perfecting life (Rom. viii. 2, 4, 13, 14; Gal. v. 16, 22, 25; vi. 8; Eph. iii. 16). While all Christian activity depends for effectiveness on the aid of the Spirit (I. Th. i. 5; I. Cor. ii. 4, 10–15), it is preëminently true that the attainment by the soul of its moral ideal is due to the Spirit, and can be secured only as the soul, putting itself into harmony with the Spirit, using the power which by his very indwelling in the soul he puts at its service, and abounding also in prayer (I. Th. v. 17), strives toward virtue and excellence and Christlikeness.

That Paul rejected "good works" and "law

works" as a method of attaining salvation, was perverted by his opponents into a charge of indifference to morality, or worse (Rom. iii. 8; vi. 1, 15), but, while he refused to regard works as a sufficient basis for hope of salvation, and, instead, unceasingly demanded faith, this faith was in his mind in no sense antagonistic to rightness of character and life, but rather a sure means of attaining his ideal; faith grasping Christ and appropriating him must transform the life (Rom. vi. 2–6; Gal. ii. 19–21). The completion of the moral transformation which he calls sanctification (I. Th. iv. 3; I. Cor. i. 30) is nowhere spoken of by Paul as being during this life practically possible. Nor is it definitely connected with the event itself of death, though this is in no way indicative of doubt as to the perfected moral condition of them that are with Christ. Paul's thought always connects the fact of this perfection with the manifestation of it at the expected revelation of the returning Lord (I. Th. v. 23; I. Cor. i. 8, 9; Col. iii. 4; II. Tim. iv. 8).

Of community life Paul makes much. He not only discusses ecclesiastical conditions and obligations, such as church discipline, the conduct of the meetings of the church, and the qualifications and duties of church officers, but also delights to emphasize the unity of the Christian community, not in one locality merely, but universally, even though this fact be often obscured by faction and dissension. The church constitutes a body of which each individual is a distinct organ (Eph. ii. 16; I. Cor. xii. 12–27), a thought which is implied in the discussions of the headship of Christ over the church, his body (Eph. i. 23; iv. 12, 16; v. 29; Col. i. 18). In reference to this joint life his instructions, warnings, and words of hope are scarcely less abundant and significant than the corresponding expressions in relation to the personal life of the individual Christian. Like the individual Christian, the community of Christians is in a very real sense made a sacred shrine by the presence and manifestation of the Holy Spirit (I. Cor. iii. 16, 17; Eph. ii. 21, 22;

I. Tim. iii. 15), and for the community as well as for the individual the end of all is spotless holiness (Eph. v. 25–27).

The letter to the Hebrews contains alike some of the most earnest exhortations that are to be found in the whole New Testament in relation to advancement toward perfection, and some of the sharpest rebukes for lack of progress in the Christian life and warnings against apostasy from it (ii. 3; iii. 12–iv. 11; v. 11–vi. 8; x. 23–31, 39; xii. 25, 29). The tone of both encouragement and censure implies an ideal which is lofty and as yet unattained. The author does not develop and distinguish the elements of this ideal; rather, he leaves it floating vaguely before the mind of the reader, inasmuch as the purpose of his writing is preëminently to prevent apostasy to Judaism, not directly to discuss moral duties. That perfection is the goal is everywhere implied, though the idea of perfection is nowhere analyzed (ix. 9; x. 1; xii. 10). It is demanded that the endeavor of the soul itself should be strenuous and especially

that it should be patient, while at the same time expectation of success rests chiefly on the efficacy of the divine co-working (vi. 10; xiii. 20, 21). As is common in the New Testament, the return of Jesus is made pivotal (ix. 28; x. 25, 37); but once at least (xii. 23) there is recognition that the Christian dead are perfect even before the return of Jesus and the resurrection. Of social Christian life and of church life and order there is little mention. Sympathetic and hospitable love of the brethren, endeavor for peace, meeting together, mutual exhortation and respect for pastors (x. 24, 25; xiii. 1–3, 17, 24) seem to exhaust the demands which touch church life. The real unity of pious souls in all ages finds repeated assertion (xi. 39, 40; xii. 22, 23).

In his letters the apostle John presents his ideal of Christian character and life largely in a negative form, though not without frequent suggestions and assertions which add positive elements to the conception of sinlessness (I. Jn. i. 6, 7; ii. 1, 6, 20; iii. 3, 6, 9–11, 14, 17; v.

18; III. Jn. 11). This ideal of sinless perfection is presented as absolutely essential to Christian experience (iii. 9); while at the same time there is such recognition of its non-attainment in practice (i. 6–ii. 2), that very many exegetical devices have been resorted to in order to harmonize the apparently inconsistent expressions. Of all explanations the simplest is to hold that John sets forth sinlessness as the only normal and rightful condition of the Christian soul, even though at the same time he well understood and implied in what he said that the actual moral condition of the soul may be abnormally and inexplicably inconsistent therewith. The ideal and the duty to strive after it remain the same, even if no one attains it. As the supreme thought of John was to lay stress on the truth that the normal condition and consequently the ideal of attainment on the part of the Christian can be no less than absolute sinlessness and Godlike holiness, he says but little as to the method and means by which to reach it. His only positive command is the often

repeated injunction to "love one another," which, however, he regards rather as proof of likeness to God than as a road thither (I. Jn. iii. 14–24; iv. 7–v. 3). That the attainment of an ideally perfect character must of necessity be postponed to the future, John never asserts. He is on the other hand sure that at the revelation of Jesus Christ we certainly shall be completely transformed into his likeness (I. Jn. iii. 2). While the first epistle treats community life only in the injunction to mutual love, the Apocalypse on the contrary is almost exclusively devoted to the various aspects of the life of the Christian community. The book begins with the letters to the Seven Churches, which represent all phases of church conditions by their varied characteristics quite as much as numerically, and almost all the rest of the book is devoted to the varying fortunes of organized Christianity on earth. While many students have endeavored to trace alike in the seven brief letters and in the symbolic representations of the rest of the book a definite course of church development through the ages, no

such attempts have as yet finally approved themselves as successful, and it is advisable to consider the book a series, not of definitely arranged and chronologically accurate forecasts, but of picturesque symbols conveying in varied forms the thought that unceasing conflict, persecution, suffering, rescue is the lot of the church in all ages until the end come.

CHAPTER XI

THE CONSUMMATION

THERE is no record in the synoptic Gospels that Jesus ever asserted what extent of time was to be allotted to the development of his kingdom. We find on the one hand that he urged on all his followers the duty of "watchfulness," which, however, is to be understood as meaning preparedness rather than expectancy (Matt. xxiv. 42–44; xxv. 13). On the other hand we find in some of the parables an implication at least that the interval before the consummation would be considerable (Matt. xiii. 24–30, 37–43; xxv. 1–30). But whether near or remote the consummation is at all events connected in his teaching with his return. In the great apocalyptic discourse just before his passion (Matt. xxiv., xxv.; Mk. xiii.; Lk. xxi. 5–36), Jesus seems to have answered two questions of

his disciples, the one, when should the destruction of Jerusalem occur; the other, what should be the sign of his own personal return and the end of the age (Matt. xxiv. 3). Probably the disciples did not at that time or till long after consciously separate the two in their thinking of them. There is, however, reason to believe that Jesus himself clearly distinguished them, and that, while he set the time for the destruction of Jerusalem within that generation, he set no date whatever for the consummation of the age (Matt. xxiv. 34–36; Mk. xiii. 28–37). Not only in these questions of the disciples, but in the references of the Master himself to this age and to the age to come, and in the later teaching of the apostles, the distinction of the ages which was common in the Jewish thought of the time seems to have been accepted. "This age," so called, is the age immediately preceding the reign of the Messiah, and "the age to come" is the age of the reign itself. The transition from the one period to the other was expected by the Jews to occur immediately on the advent of the

Messiah, but in Christian thought it is associated with his return, so far as it is brought in connection with any other fact. Not only is the kingdom of Christ consummated at the return when all that is evil shall be gathered out of it (Matt. xiii. 39–42), but much that concerns the individual is likewise associated with that return. While the reunion of soul and body, which is throughout the Scriptural idea of resurrection, is definitely foretold in the synoptic teaching of Jesus (Mk. xii. 26; Lk. xiv. 14; xx. 35, 36), it is not brought into clear relations with the return. Judgment, on the other hand, which is to be followed by its issues of endless joy or penal sufferings, is definitely connected with the second advent (Matt. vii. 22, 23; xxv. 31–46).

The Johannine record, as it is silent touching the proclamation of the inauguration of the kingdom, is no less silent as to its consummation. It is, however, unmistakably taught that Christ would return to earth. While this teaching may be fulfilled in part by a merely spiritual

presence (Jn. xiv. 3, 18), in part a personal return is no less clearly demanded (xxi. 22, 23). The resurrection of the dead is made to depend upon the authority of Jesus (v. 26, 29; vi. 39, 40; xi. 25), and judgment, future as well as present, is assigned to him (v. 27). But it is to be recognized that there is no systematic attempt to correlate these facts and to set them in their relations to each other.

The first apostolic preaching taught the return of Jesus, conditioning it on preparedness for his coming (Acts iii. 19–21), and the apostles watched with interest the developing purpose of God in the ingathering of the Gentiles (Acts xv. 14–17). James in his letter speaks of the return of the Lord as imminent, but not necessarily as immediate, for he urges patience while it must be waited for (James v. 7–11). Jude recognizes that he and his contemporaries are living in the closing epoch of the world's history, but whatever his unspoken thought may have been, he sets no limit to the duration of this epoch (Jude 18). He speaks of judg-

ment also, "the judgment of the great day" (Jude 6). In the substance of their teaching the two letters of Peter agree. In the first he declares that the end of all things has approached (I. Pet. iv. 7), a phrase the significance of which it is easy to overpress, as it may mean only that till the end shall come there is to be expected only the development of what is now in progress. The consummation is thought of as the next all important event in the world's history, an event known to be the next, but how near, unknown, imminent but by no means certainly immediate. Salvation in its completeness is something laid up in heaven, awaiting revelation at the end of all things at the manifestation of Jesus Christ (I. Pet. i. 7, 13), while most solemn questions suggest what the apostle expected would be the doom of the ungodly and the sinner (I. Pet. iv. 17, 18). To these thoughts of impending end, of revelation of Christ at his return and of then completed salvation with its correlate of evil doom, the second letter makes marked but consistent additions.

The present is the final era of the world's history (II. Pet. iii. 3). The doom is still regarded as certain and as, in spite of all delays, yet impending, for though he himself will die without the sight of it (II. Pet. i. 13–15), and the scoffers mock at the delaying promise (II. Pet. iii. 3, 4), yet the return of the Lord, called in the familiar phrase "the day of the Lord" (II. Pet. iii. 10), is delayed only in grace and is sure to come, while out of the tremendous catastrophe will come a renewed dwelling place for men (II. Pet. iii. 5–13).

As usual Paul's teaching as to the consummation is fuller, clearer and at the same time more provocative of discussion than that of the rest of the apostles. The first teaching to be noted is in the first letter from his pen which has been preserved, and is doctrinally its most important part. The Thessalonians were troubled by a difficulty which, though very strange to us, was no less real to them, it being no other than the fear that dead believers would in some measure lose their share in the bless-

ings to be brought by the returning Lord. In response Paul assured them that the departed saints would lose no part nor place in the consummated kingdom, for the very first event in the closing scenes would be the resurrection of the dead believers in Christ, after which they with the Christians still living would be "caught up" to be forever with Christ (I. Th. iv. 13–17). The fact that Paul here uses "we" in speaking of such as shall be alive at Christ's return, has often been overpressed alike exegetically and dogmatically. It may be granted that his language received its tone from a personal and private expectation that the return would occur during his lifetime. But it is to be understood that he could not have gained this expectation from revelation, like the theology which he preached, nor did he regard it as authoritative like that, for it is significant and important to heed that he scrupulously avoided formulating the expectation into dogmatic statement. He nowhere asserts that he shall be living to see the Lord's return. It must also be remem-

bered that, at the time of writing, Paul himself necessarily belonged to the class of living saints, and that without a noticeable effort he could scarcely separate himself from his class, which as a class would continue to the end. It is again to be noted that in the warning which follows as to the dawning of "the day of the Lord," it is not said that it would come immediately, or even soon, but that when it should come it would be unheralded and by many unexpected (I. Th. v. 2, 3). It soon appeared that even this teaching had been misunderstood and misused (as it has been by so many since) by some of the Thessalonians, who held that the day of the Lord was on the very point of dawning, if indeed it had not already dawned, and accordingly had given up their regular work. So, in his second letter, Paul assured them that much history yet remained to be made in the way of apostasy and consummation of evil (II. Th. ii. 3–12), and he gave no assurance or even clue to his own expectation as to how long this history might be in the making.

Nowhere later does Paul lay special stress on the idea that the return of Christ is a fact which immediately impends. While there is no reason to suppose that his views changed, the stress on them ceased, because occasion for it was lacking. In the Corinthian epistles there was much eschatological teaching, but it relates to other topics. At Corinth the certainty and character of the reëmbodiment of the souls of believers was the burning question. So he discusses this (I. Cor. xv.), asserting and arguing three facts: reëmbodiment, relation of the body that is to be to the body that now is, unlikeness of the future body to the present. To this is added the assertion that the resurrection of the dead is associated with the return of Christ, and that there will be a simultaneous transformation of the believers then living, with whom Paul still classes himself, though very soon after (II. Cor. v. 1–4) he at least suggests the possibility of his own death. These passages have sometimes been forced into an improbable inconsistency. The explanation of their unlike-

ness is that in the former he with joyful hope emphasized reëmbodiment, and in the second, with somewhat of dread but without a hint of change in views, he emphasized the fact of temporary bodilessness, which would, however, be followed by the assumption of a body which should as conspicuously bear the stamp of heaven as the present of earth. In all his letters Paul is silent as to the resurrection of unbelievers, and the arguments by which he confirms his teaching as to the resurrection of believers do not necessarily imply it. But this silence may reasonably be attributed to the fact that this truth fell outside the scope of his argument, and he may have had unrecorded arguments for it, as is implied in Luke's summary of Paul's sermon at Athens and his preaching to Felix (Acts xvii. 31 ; xxiv. 25). Judgment is emphasized by the apostle, and is associated with the offices of Jesus (Acts xvii. 31 ; xxiv. 25 ; I. Cor. iii. 13 ; II. Cor. v. 10 ; II. Tim. iv. 8). With the return of Christ comes not only resurrection and judgment but

also the perfection and glory of believers (Rom. viii. 17; II. Tim. ii. 12; iv. 8). The consummated kingdom will exert an influence beyond the circle of believers, accomplishing the renovation and transformation even of the physical universe (Rom. viii. 19–22). Paul tells farther, though somewhat obscurely, of a surrender of the mediatorial kingdom by Christ (I. Cor. xv. 24–28) in order more clearly to manifest the single supreme sovereignty of God and the Father.

The theme and method of the letter to the Hebrews are such that little space is given to the consummation. That judgment follows death (ix. 27; x. 27), that Christ will reappear to complete our salvation, and that "the day" is approaching (ix. 28; x. 25, 37), these teachings are practically all that is to be found in this epistle.

The teaching of John as to the consummation must be chiefly drawn from the Apocalypse, though in the letters there is recognition that this is the last era of history

(I. Jn. ii. 18), and the future manifestation of Christ is promised (I. Jn. iii. 2). Throughout the greater part of Revelation it would be an error to look for exactness of chronological order, but at the end of the book such exactness may be readily and fairly recognized. The apostle sets in order, as a direct revelation from the risen Christ himself, resurrection, judgment and the picture of the consummated kingdom (xx. 11—xxi. 5). As to the much discussed "Millennial" passage (xx. 4–6) it needs only to be said that it is most safely interpreted as figurative, thus giving no basis for the doctrine of a personal "Millennial" reign of Christ with his saints, or for the doctrine of two distinct resurrections, a theory for which there is no clear support to be found in the whole New Testament.

It thus appears, in spite of the brevity and frequent obscurity of the hints of the New Testament teachers, that their views as to the consummation are in substantial agreement with each other. They hold that the mission of

Christ began the final epoch of the world's history, an epoch of undefined and at present undefinable duration. Regarding the time of this impending end there is no revelation, but this very uncertainty is made the basis of urgent appeals for constant preparedness for this end, whenever it shall come. Christ and his apostles agree in teaching that at the end Jesus will return in personal manifestation; the souls of the dead will be reëmbodied, which is resurrection; all will be judged; and the kingdom will be consummated in eternal felicity and glory.

INDEX

OF

NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES CITED

MATTHEW

MARK

LUKE

JOHN

ACTS

ROMANS

I. CORINTHIANS

II. CORINTHIANS

GALATIANS

EPHESIANS

PHILIPPIANS

COLOSSIANS

I. THESSALONIANS

II. THESSALONIANS

I. TIMOTHY

II. TIMOTHY

TITUS

HEBREWS

JAMES

I. PETER

II. PETER

I. JOHN

INDEX OF TOPICS